

On the existence of the magnetic monopole and the non-existence of the Higgs-particle

Engel Roza¹

Summary

In this paper the existence of the Higgs field is taken as an undeniable starting point. However, the origin of the field is challenged. Rather than ascribing the origin of it to a yet undiscovered phantom particle, the origin is ascribed directly to electromagnetic energy, in particular as magnetic charge next to electric charge of elementary pointlike particles. To this end two instruments are used. The first one is the transform of the Higgs field from a functional description into a spatial description, without changing the basic properties. The other instrument is the concept of the magnetic monopole, as introduced by Dirac. The two instruments appear to fit well together. The results of all of this is that electromagnetic energy on its own is the source of all mass. It implies that the search after the Higgs particle will remain fruitless. No other equations, apart from Maxwell's Equations and Dirac's Equation are required to express the fundamentals of quantum waves and quantum fields, which makes the disputed Klein Gordon Equation obsolete. The theory reveals an algorithm to explain the ratios between the lepton masses. In that sense the theory shows a predictive element, while grosso modo, as shown, no derogation is done to the results and instruments of canonic theory.

1. Introduction

Since the definition of its concept by Peter Higgs in 1964 a continuous search has been made after a particular massive elementary scalar particle, known as the Higgs boson [1]. Since the unification of the weak nuclear force with electromagnetic force, by the work of Glashow, Salam and Weinberg [2,3] and final theoretical proofs by Marinus Veltman and Gerard 't Hooft [5], this particle is believed to be the corner stone of the so called Standard Model. However, in spite of efforts over more than forty years the particle has not been found. Among other reasons, the existence of such a particle is therefore not undisputed [6]. There is however firm belief that the particle will be detected soon, after full operation of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) in the spring of 2009. The existence of a potential field of a type as produced by this particle, known as the Higgs field, is undeniable, because of many succesful verifications by experiments of phenomena pre-

1. Engel Roza (1940) is a retired electrical engineer from Philips Research Labs, Eindhoven, The Netherlands

dicted by such fields. If the electromagnetic Maxwell laws are maintained in its classical relativistic format, there is no other way than ascribing the origin of this field to an undiscovered particle.

But what if the Maxwell laws are not maintained unimpaired? Historically a number of proposals have been put forward to generalize these laws. The most prominent ones are the generalizations as put forward by Paul Dirac in [7] and Alexandru Proca in [8]. Dirac proposed his generalization because of his wonder about an asymmetry in Maxwell's equations. His wonder had to do with the absence of magnetic space charge in these equations as a result of a clear absence of it in experimental physics. Driven by his devotion for beauty Dirac symmetrized the equations by an hypothetical existence of a magnetic source, next to the existing electric source. He made clear that a verified existence of a magnetic monopole would explain the discrete nature of both electric and magnetic charges. So, a long and still continuing search began in an attempt to find experimental verification of such a magnetic monopole. Dirac himself did not urge the necessity of its existence, but never denied its existence either. Despite of efforts over more that seventy years, the magnetic monopole has not been found.

In an attempt to explain the short range characteristics of nuclear forces by electromagnetism Proca suggested to generalize the Maxwellian Lagrangian by an extra term, proportional to mass. By doing so, Maxwellian laws would maintain its validity for zero mass and the vectorpotential would show an exponential decay for non-zero mass. In fact he formulated the hypothesis that a massive electromagnetic particle would exist, next to the massless photon. As pointed out by Yukawa [9] in 1935, this model fits with the *virtual* particle theory for bosons: a short range force between nucleons is transferred by force-carrying particles, similarly as force exchange between charged particles is due to photons. The particles are said to be "virtual", because there is no energy available to produce the particles: they have to disappear within a time interval as imposed by the uncertainty principle. These theories appeared to be quite succesful as Yukawa could predict rather accurately the characteristics of such particles, known as pi-mesons, which were verified experimentally indeed. However it appeared later that Proca's equations do not meet the so called gauge condition of the Yang Mills principle [10], which is believed to be a major fundament in the theory of the Standard Model. In a next section we shall elaborate on this.

In spite of these disclaimers we wish to show in this paper the feasibility of an Higgs field on the basis of generalized Maxwellian equations. We wish to show that the introduction of magnetic space charge into these equations has a short range force resultant which matches with the characteristics of the weak nuclear force, without violating the gauge condition of the Yang Mills principle. We shall also explain why an isolated magnetic monopole has never been found in spite of such a presumed existence of magnetic space charge. The implication of this will be that electromagnetic energy on its own, without anything else, is capable to form a fundament below the Standard Model and that no other equations apart from Maxwell equations and the Dirac equation are required for mathematical descriptions. There is no need for an hypothetical elementary massive scalar particle, nor for its presumed Klein Gordon wave equation.

The paper is organized as follows. In the second section Dirac's wave equation in free space will be reviewed. This will serve as an introduction for a review of Yang-Mills concept in section 3. In section 4 a view will be presented on the relationship between the concept of Lagrangian density and quantummechanical wave equations. In section 5 an alternative description will be given for

the Higgs field. Section 6 deals with wave function doublets like associated with mesons. In section 7 the origin of the Higgs field is related to magnetic monopoles. In section 8 the theory as developed in this paper is compared with the present canonic theory. Finally, in section 9 it is shown that the Higgs field as created by magnetic monopoles gives an explanation for the mass relationships between leptons (electrons, muons and taus).

2. Dirac's Equation

Historically Dirac derived his equation for electrons in order to provide a relativistic wave equation as an alternative for the Klein-Gordon Equation which up to then was seen as the relativistic generalization of Schrodinger's Equation [11]. These equations are supposed to have probabilistic semantics (the so called Born interpretation), which means that the squared absolute value of the amplitude of the wave function solution represents the probability that a particle is at certain moment at a certain position. This imposes the requirement of time independancy of the spatial integral of the squared absolute value of the wave function. This requirement is known as the requirement for positive definiteness. To meet this requirement, the temporal derivative in the wave equation has to be of first order. This is the case for Schrodinger's wave equation, but is not the case for the Klein-Gordon Equation. That was the basic motivation for Dirac to develop an alternative.

To keep things simple we wish to review Dirac's equation for a single spatial dimension. This is sufficient to underline the thread of analysis in succeeding sections. With this background, generalization towards three spatial dimensions can easily be found in textbooks. Dirac has based his equation on Einstein's famous energy relationship for moving massive particles. This relationship can be expressed as:

$$p_0^2 + p_x^2 = -m_0^2 c^2, \quad (2-1)$$

wherein m_0 is the mass in rest, c the velocity of light in vacuum and wherein p_i are relativistic momenta. These momenta are defined as:

$$p_i = m_0 \frac{dx_i}{d\tau}, \text{ wherein } x_1 = x, x_0 = t' \text{ and } t' = jct \text{ with } j = \sqrt{-1}. \quad (2-2)$$

The momenta are expressed in proper time τ , i.e. in the time frame of a co-moving observer. The normalized time coordinate $t' = jct$ is treated on par with the spatial coordinate(s). Later on the basic quantummechanical hypothesis will be used, wherein momenta are transformed into operators on wave functions such that:

$$p_i \rightarrow \hat{p}_i \Psi \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{p}_i = \frac{\hbar}{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}. \quad (2-3)$$

In fact there is a slight, but not unimportant, difference between the Einsteinean relativistic energy W and the energy parameter E connected to the temporal moment. The Einsteinean energy W is defined as:

$$W = \sqrt{(m_0 c^2)^2 + p_x^2}, \quad (2-4)$$

whereas from (2-1):

$$E^2 = -p_0^2 = (m_0 c^2)^2 + p_x^2. \quad (2-5)$$

There is therefore a sign ambiguity between W and E . Later on we shall come back on this.

Let us normalise (2-1) as:

$$p_0'^2 + p_x'^2 + 1 = 0 \quad \text{with } p_i' = \frac{p_i}{m_0 c}, \quad i = 0, 1. \quad (2-6)$$

Dirac wrote this expression as the square of a linear relationship:

$$p_0'^2 + p_x'^2 + 1 = (\alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}' + \beta) \cdot (\alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}' + \beta) = 0, \quad \text{with } \alpha(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) \text{ and } \mathbf{p}'(p_0', p_x'). \quad (2-7)$$

thereby leaving open for the moment the numbertype of the number β and of the components α_0 and α_1 of the twodimensional vector α .

The elaboration of the middle term is:

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}' + \beta) \cdot (\alpha \cdot \mathbf{p}' + \beta) &= \left(\beta + \sum_i \alpha_i p_i' \right) \left(\beta + \sum_j \alpha_j p_j' \right) \\ &= \beta^2 + \sum_i \beta \alpha_i p_i' + \sum_j \beta \alpha_j p_j' + \sum_i \sum_j \alpha_i \alpha_j p_i' p_j' \\ &= \beta^2 + \sum_i (\beta \alpha_i + \alpha_i \beta) p_i' + \sum_{i \neq j} (\alpha_i \alpha_j + \alpha_j \alpha_i) p_i' p_j' + \sum_i \alpha_i^2 p_i'^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2-8)$$

To equate this middle term with the left hand term the following conditions should be true:

$$\alpha_i \alpha_j + \alpha_j \alpha_i = 0 \quad \text{if } i \neq j; \quad \beta \alpha_i + \alpha_i \beta = 0$$

and

$$\alpha_i^2 = 1, \quad \beta^2 = 1 \quad \text{for } i = 0, 1. \quad (2-9)$$

From these expressions it will be clear that the numbers α_i and β have to be of special type. To this end Dirac invoked the use of the Pauli-matrices, which are defined as:

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -j \\ j & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2-10)$$

In addition to these also the unity matrix is required, which is defined as:

$$\sigma_0 = I = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (2-11)$$

It can simply be verified that:

$$\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = \sigma_3^2 = 1$$

$$\sigma_1\sigma_2 = j\sigma_3; \quad \sigma_3\sigma_1 = j\sigma_2, \quad \sigma_2\sigma_3 = j\sigma_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_i\sigma_j = -\sigma_j\sigma_i \quad \text{for} \quad i \neq j. \quad (2-12)$$

So, squaring of the momentum relationship, as in (2-6), can be justified if (for instance):

$$\alpha = \alpha(\sigma_3, \sigma_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \sigma_2. \quad (2-13)$$

Note: It may seem that the Pauli matrices can be assigned in an arbitrary order. However, this freedom does appear not to exist. The reason is that the Dirac decomposition is not the only condition that has to be fulfilled. There is an additional constraint which states that:

$$\Psi_1\Psi_2^* + \Psi_2\Psi_1^* = 0. \quad (2-14a)$$

This constraint is a consequence of the requirement for positive definiteness of the probability function $Pr(x, t)$ given by:

$$Pr(x, t) = \Psi_1\Psi_1^* + \Psi_2\Psi_2^* = |\Psi_1|^2 + |\Psi_2|^2 \quad (2-14b)$$

As we shall see, the assignment given by (2-14) will eventually yield a solution that satisfies condition (2-12a). In most textbooks this assignment problem is usually overlooked and the problem is settled by quoting something as: “among the various possibilities we choose....”.

As the impulse relationship is twodimensional, the wave function Ψ should be twodimensional as well. Therefore $\Psi = \Psi(\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$. After transforming the impulses into operators on wave functions (see 2-3), the impulse relationship is transformed into the following twodimensional wave equation:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_1 \\ \hat{\sigma}_2 \\ \hat{\sigma}_3 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}'_0 \Psi_1 \\ \hat{p}'_0 \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_2 \\ \hat{\sigma}_3 \\ \hat{\sigma}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}'_x \Psi_1 \\ \hat{p}'_x \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_3 \\ \hat{\sigma}_1 \\ \hat{\sigma}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad (2-15)$$

or, with explicit expressions of the Pauli-matrices:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}'_0 \Psi_1 \\ \hat{p}'_0 \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}'_x \Psi_1 \\ \hat{p}'_x \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -j \\ j & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (2-16)$$

This reads as the following two equations:

$$\hat{p}'_0 \Psi_2 + \hat{p}'_x \Psi_1 - j \Psi_2 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{p}'_0 \Psi_1 - \hat{p}'_x \Psi_2 + j \Psi_1 = 0, \quad (2-17)$$

or, after denormalisation (2-4):

$$\hat{p}_0 \Psi_2 + \hat{p}_x \Psi_1 - j m_0 c \Psi_2 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{p}_0 \Psi_1 - \hat{p}_x \Psi_2 + j m_0 c \Psi_1 = 0, \quad (2-18a,b)$$

or, in matrix terms:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{p}_x & \hat{p}_0 - j m_0 c \\ \hat{p}_0 + j m_0 c & -\hat{p}_x \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_1 \\ \Psi_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (2-19)$$

Such first order partial differential equations have harmonic wave function solutions of the type:

$$\Psi_i(x, t) = u_i \exp \left[j \left(\beta \frac{p_x}{\hbar} x - \frac{E}{\hbar} t \right) \right], \quad (2-20)$$

with parameters u_i, p_x, E, β . The characteristics of these parameters are reflected in the chosen symbols: the dimensionality of p_x is that of a momentum, the dimensionality of E is that of an energy, β is dimensionless and u_i is the amplitude of the wave function.

This implies that the two components of the wave function are supposed to have a similar behavior, but that they may differ in amplitude, albeit that may show a temporal time shift. The latter is the case if a phase factor is included in u_i , which implies that u_i might be complex.

After substitution of (2-20) into (2-19) we find:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \beta p_x & j(E/c - m_0 c) \\ j(E/c + m_0 c) & -\beta p_x \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (2-21)$$

Non-trivial solutions for u_i are obtained if the determinant of the matrix is zero. This is true if:

$$\frac{E^2}{c^2} = \beta^2 p_x^2 + m_0^2 c^2. \quad (2-22)$$

Comparing this expression with (2-1) and (2-5) we conclude that the condition of a zero value for the determinant reads as:

$$\beta = \pm 1, \quad (2-23)$$

This means that the assumptions we made on the character of the wave function, as expressed by (2-20) are justified. It also means a dual outcome of the determinant expression. This dual outcome simply means that the spatial part of the wave function can be a real function instead of just a complex one. And that is what we would expect from a wave function which meets the requirements for locality. Only if the wave function is spatially real it is possible to compose a spatially confined package of energy out of an ensemble of individual wave functions. So, we would have to be surprised if the outcome of the determinant expression would *not* have been dual.

Let us now calculate the ratio of the amplitude values u_i . It follows now straightforwardly from (2-21) that

$$u_2 = \pm j \frac{v_x}{c(w+1)} \quad \text{if } u_1 = 1. \quad (2-24),$$

wherein $w = \sqrt{1 - (v_x/c)^2}$.

This means that the amplitude of the second component of the wave function is usually much smaller than the first component. In the non relativistic limit this component is negligible. The imaginary value of the amplitude of the second component implies a ninety degree temporal phase shift of the second component as compared with the main component. Obviously there are two possible values of the phase factor. It is therefore said that the “spin” can be positive or negative.

There is something more. By substitution of (2-23) into (2-22) and subsequent evaluation under consideration of (2-4) and (2-5) we learn that:

$$E = \pm W \quad (2-25)$$

That means that Dirac's equation is not only satisfied by a positive value of E but by a negative value as well. As long as no semantics are connected to the parameter E , this sign ambiguity does not mean anything else apart from a *frequency ambiguity* in the wave function (2-20). And, according to the Born-interpretation, frequency ambiguity has no influence on the observability of a particle.

Nevertheless this phenomenon is usually be regarded as Dirac's famous puzzle of "*negative energy*". So, what was the reason of Dirac's wonder? The reason is a wonder about the interpretation of a negative temporal moment. Obviously Dirac's equation can be satisfied by two types of wave function, one with a positive frequency and another with a negative frequency. Do these two wave equations imply two types of particles or do they just imply that one and the same particle can be represented by two different wave functions? Or even stronger: does it imply that the second wave function implies that the particle can be in two different states (apart from the spin state)? It is clear that more types of particles hypothetically can satisfy these wave equations as long as the dynamics of motion are the same. But if the particles are distinguishable it can only be done by a parameter which has no influence on the dynamics of motion.

Such a particle was indentified in 1932, when Anderson discovered a particle with the same rest-mass as the electron, but with positive electric charge: the *positron*. Anderson's nebula chamber experiment showed the simultaneous generation from cosmic rays of electrons and positrons in parallel paths which deviate by magnetic fields. This suggested the conversion of zero mass particles of electromagnetic energy into dual mass particles with opposite charge. This phenomenon shows that electrons and positrons are intimately related particles with the same mass but in a different state. This state difference between electrons and positrons can adequately be attributed to the difference in sign of the relativistic temporal momentum. Therefore a positron can be regarded as an electron moving backwards in time, i.e. as an electron in a different state. As a positron and electron are generated by a zero mass particle of electromagnetic energy, they may destroy each other as well, thereby generating electromagnetic radiation. The theoretical modelling of such kind of processes is beyond the scope of classical or relativistic quantummechanics. Therefore quantummechanical theory has been extended towards Quantum Field Theory (QFT).

The theoretical prediction of this *antiparticle* and its later experimental verification is now seen as one of the great triumphs in the history of science. The present state of art in quantumtheory on nuclear particles has revealed more of those symmetries, implying many other antiparticles (*anti-matter*).

This simplified view on Dirac's Equation is helpful to highlight some consequences, which remain usually undiscussed in most textbooks. In a Side Note added to this paper one of these issues is discussed. It deals with the question about the characteristics of a valid wave equation under the assumption that the spin component is sufficiently small to be neglected.

3. Yang Mills Principle

So far we have only considered wave equations in free space. In this section we wish to study wave functions of particles moving in a space under influence of external fields of forces. We shall base this study upon Dirac's Equation and we will start from some observations for time-

space with a single spatial dimension. As derived above, Dirac's Equation has the solution given by:

$$\Psi_1 = u_1 \exp\left[-j\frac{E}{\hbar}t\right] \left\{ \alpha_c \cos\left[\frac{p_x}{\hbar}x\right] + \alpha_s \sin\left[\frac{p_x}{\hbar}x\right] \right\}$$

and:
$$\Psi_2 = ju_2 \exp\left[-j\frac{E}{\hbar}t\right] \left\{ \alpha_c \cos\left[\frac{p_x}{\hbar}x\right] + \alpha_s \sin\left[\frac{p_x}{\hbar}x\right] \right\}, \quad \alpha_c, \alpha_s, u_1, u_2 \text{ real valued.} \quad (3-1)$$

The wave function interpretation in terms of a probability density function is:

$$Pr(x, t) = \Psi_1 \Psi_1^* + \Psi_1 \Psi_2^* + \Psi_2 \Psi_1^* + \Psi_2 \Psi_2^* = |\Psi_1|^2 + |\Psi_2|^2 \quad (3-2)$$

The cancelling of the crossproducts is due to a particular phase relationship between Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 :

$$\Psi_2 = \frac{u_2}{u_1} \exp\left[-j\frac{\pi}{2}\right] \Psi_1 \quad (3-3)$$

As (3-2) is the major property for an extension of a simplex scalar wave function towards a wave function with dual format, we might ask if other relationships apart from (3-3) would provide the same property. Let us inspect (3-1) for the purpose. Under a constant phaseshift ϑ_0 , such that:

$$\exp\left[-j\frac{E}{\hbar}t\right] \rightarrow \exp\left[-j\left(\frac{E}{\hbar}t + \vartheta_0\right)\right],$$

property (3-2) remains valid. This property is known under the name *global phase invariance* of the wave function. Interestingly, property (3-2) remains valid as well if the phaseshift shows a spatial dependency, i.e. if

$$\exp\left[-j\frac{E}{\hbar}t\right] \rightarrow \exp\left[-j\left(\frac{E}{\hbar}t + \vartheta(x)\right)\right]. \quad (3-4)$$

This is known as *local phase invariance* of the wave function. Where the global phase invariance shows up as a result of an arbitrary integration constant in the solution of Dirac's equation in free space, local phase invariance does not. So it requires an additional influence.

Yang and Mills hypothesised (in 1954) *that under influence of a field of forces the global phase invariance of quantummechanical wave functions is changed into local phase invariance*, similarly as Einstein's hypothesis of change of global Lorentz-transform invariance into local Lorentz-transform invariance under similar conditions [9]. Similarly as Einstein's Principle of

Equivalence this Yang Mills Principle excels in beauty and, as will be shown below, it will enable an elegant transform of free space quantummechanical wave equations into wave equations in fields of forces.

To investigate the feasibility we apply a generic phase rotation on the wave function, such that:

$$\Psi_0 + j\Psi_1 = \exp[-j\vartheta(x)]\{\Psi_0' + j\Psi_1'\} \quad (3-5)$$

Herein the $\Psi' = \Psi_0' + j\Psi_1'$ represents the global phase invariant wave function and $\Psi = \Psi_0 + j\Psi_1$ represents the presupposed local phase invariant wave function. It is supposed that both these functions obey the same wave equation if this wave equation has a suitable covariant format. To establish this format covariant derivatives have to be found in terms of a vector-field $\mathbf{A}(A_0, A_x)$ which is supposed to be the cause of the change of global phase invariance into local phase invariance.

A covariant derivative $D\Psi/\partial x_i$ has to obey the property that it transforms similarly as the argument Ψ (3-5), so as:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta(x)]\frac{D\Psi'}{\partial x_i} \quad \text{wherein } x_0 = jct \text{ and } x_1 = x \quad (3-6)$$

As will be shown below, this can be obtained by defining the covariant derivative as:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x_i} + jqA_i\Psi \quad (3-7)$$

If $\vartheta(x)$ were a simple constant, the spatial and temporal derivatives would have the format:

$$\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta(x)]\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\Psi' \quad (3-8)$$

But the spatial dependence spoils this simple format for the spatial derivative into:

$$\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x} = \exp[-j\vartheta(x)]\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Psi' - j\exp[-j\vartheta(x)]\Psi'\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\vartheta(x) \quad (3-9)$$

To guarantee compatibility between conditions (3-6), (3-7) and (3-8), the field components A_i have to fulfill the following condition (see appendix):

$$qA_i = qA_i' + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\vartheta(x) \quad (3-10)$$

Herein q is a proportionality factor, known as coupling constant. In the case of electromagnetic fields the coupling factor is identified as electric charge. Under this condition the covariant derivative has the format as defined in (3-7). It is a so called *gauge condition*. Note that this condition is a result of the proposed format for the covariant derivative under the covariance condition. Another format would have resulted in another gauge condition. Such a gauge condition can always be *formulated* but can not always be *met*. It is met if the Lagrangian density of the (gauge) field is invariant under the gauge condition. The Lagrangian density is expressed by:

$$\mathcal{L}_g = -\frac{1}{16\pi} \sum_i \sum_j |F_{ij}|^2 \quad \text{wherein} \quad F_{ij} = \frac{\partial A_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x_j} \quad (3-11)$$

It can be easily verified that under condition (3-10):

$$F_{ij} = \frac{\partial A_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial A_i}{\partial x_j} = F'_{ij} = \frac{\partial A'_j}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial A'_i}{\partial x_j} \quad (3-12)$$

The underlying reason is that the addition of scalar function on A_x has no influence on the magnetic field ($\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A}$). Or, formulated more principally:

The very reason that covariant derivatives can be found in terms of the vectorfield \mathbf{A} is the fact that the Lagrangian density of this vectorfield is invariant under local phase rotations.

The relevance of the considerations above is this: the wave function of particle moving in a field forces can be found by solving its wave equation. This wave equation is a transformed version of the free field wave equation. The transformation consists out of replacing normal derivatives by covariant derivatives. The format of the covariant derivative is subject to a gauge condition on the vector potential of the field forces. The format of the gauge condition results from application of the Yang-Mills hypothesis. This hypothesis supposes that the global phase invariance of the wave function of a free moving particle is changed into local phase invariance if the particle is subject to a field of forces.

In fact the Yang-Mills hypothesis does not reveal anything new in the case of quantum electrodynamics (QED). It is just another formulation for the so called *principle of minimum substitution*. This principle states that the wave equation of a charged particle moving in an electromagnetic field can be found from the equation of motion in a free field after transform of the momenta by the rule

$$p_i \rightarrow p_i - jqA_i$$

and subsequent application of the basic quantummechanical theorem:

$$\hat{p}_i \Psi \rightarrow (\hat{p}_i - jqA_i) \Psi \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{p}_i = \frac{\hbar}{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$$

As electromagnetic theory can be captured as a subset within the larger Yang-Mills framework, other fields of forces may do as well. So, nucleon forces are candidates as well. A main difference between electromagnetic force and nuclear force is the effective range of influence: where electromagnetic forces (and gravitational forces) are long ranged, nucleon forces are short ranged. As already mentioned in the introduction, in 1935, in an attempt to bring nucleon forces within the electromagnetic framework, Proca had suggested a generalization of Maxwell's equations by introducing a mass term, which appeared to have the desired effect. In the next section, which deals with the relationship between Lagrangian density and wave equations, we shall come back on this.

4. Lagrangian density and wave equations

There is some ambiguity in the concept of wave equations in quantum theory. Sometimes the semantics are probabilistic and sometimes energetic. The quantummechanical wave equation of a particle is probabilistic: the square of the wave function solution is the probability to find the particle at a certain time at a certain position. It is therefore prone to confusion, although not always incorrect, to derive such a quantummechanical wave equation from a Lagrangian density [12]. Lagrangian density is an energetic concept. At the other hand electromagnetic waves are clearly energetic and there is no objection to apply the Lagrangian density as a condensed format for their description. A force sensitive particle, such as an electron, is both *target* of an energetic field and *source* of it. As Dirac's Equation (unlike the Klein Gordon Equation) has a decent Lagrangian density [13] it is possible and common practice to assemble a composite Lagrangian density to capture both these aspects. Within the scope of this paper we prefer an alternative approach. We wish to adopt initially a dual assignment: one wave function and associated wave equation for the probabilistic (fermionic) aspect and an additional separate one for the energetic (bosonic) aspect. For the bosonic aspect the Lagrangian density concept will be used, for the fermionic aspect we wish to elaborate directly in terms of a wave equation without a Lagrangian layer above. Later on we wish to rediscuss the feasibility of a composite Lagrangian density. For further clearness we shall use the symbol Ψ for fermionic wave functions and the symbol Φ for the scalar part of a vector field.

Fig. 1 is a graphical illustration of the model. At the right it is indicated that the free space Dirac's Equation is directly formulated from the mass of the particle, i.e. electron. The free space wave equation is transformed under influence of an external energetic vector field (by application of Yang Mills Principle) into the "in-field wave equation". This represents the fermionic aspect. If

desired, this fermionic path can be simplified by ignoring spin. This is shown by the dotted boxes in the upper right part of the figure.




Fig. 1: Relationship between Lagrangian density and wave equations.

The left hand part illustrates the generation of the bosonic field, i.e. the electromagnetic field, by the particle, i.e. electron. A scalar wave equation, i.e. the potential field, is derived from the electromagnetic Lagrangian density by application of the Euler-Lagrange equations. After application of the Lorenz-gauge the full electromagnetic vector field is obtained, which acts as an interfering field for other particles sensitive for electromagnetic fields. In this picture self-interaction (a refinement in Quantum Field Theory) is not taken into consideration. The picture also shows the relationship between the mass of an electron and the electromagnetic energy created by it. In the case that we have to do with a pointlike particle, such as an electron, the spatial integral of the components of the vector field, such as electric and magnetic field strengths, determine the mass of the particle.

Note: Usually the Lagrangian density of the electromagnetic field is expressed in terms of (3-11), covariantly written as:

$$\mathcal{L}_g = -\frac{1}{16\pi} F^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \quad (4-A)$$

From this Lagrangian density a wave equation is derived in terms of the (four)vectorpotential \mathbf{A} , which assumes a simple format under an additional condition. The format is:

$$\frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{A}}{\partial t^2} - (\nabla \cdot \nabla) \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{J}. \quad (4-B)$$

The vector \mathbf{J} contains the sources of the field, i.e. currents and space charge. The additional condition is known as the Lorenz-gauge. It reads as::

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = 0. \quad (4-C)$$

As long as we are only interested in the potential field Φ , which is (apart from a proportionality constant) the very first component of the vectorpotential, we may work with a simplified wave equation and consequently with a simplified Lagrangian density.

The picture as shown in fig.1 has been assembled with the electron in mind. Let us forget now the electron in an attempt to generalize the picture to other type of particles, particularly with respect to the bosonic field that they may generate. Let us model this bosonic field by means of a Lagrangian density with a generic stationary part of the format:

$$\mathcal{L}_g = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \Phi)^2 - U(\Phi) \quad (4-1)$$

From this Lagrangian the wave equation is derived via the Lagrange-Euler equations, resulting into:

$$\nabla(\nabla \Phi) = \frac{d}{d\Phi} U(\Phi) \quad (4-2)$$

Wave equations are often expressed in terms of *potential functions* $V_\Phi(\Phi)$ (also called potential for short) rather than in *potential energy* $U(\Phi)$. Equation (4-2) then has the format:

$$\nabla(\nabla \Phi) = V_\Phi(\Phi) \Phi \quad \text{so that} \quad V_\Phi(\Phi) \Phi = \frac{d}{d\Phi} U(\Phi) \quad (4-3)$$

Such potential functions can not only expressed functionally as $V_\Phi(\Phi)$ but, equivalently, spatially as well as $V(x, y, z)$.

If $U(\Phi) = 0$ and if the field is rotatic symmetric, the field is Coulomb-like ($V(r) \sim 1/r$) and has therefore a long range. Short range properties of energetic fields require particular formats for $U(\Phi)$. A characteristic example is the exponentially decaying Proca-field $V(r) \sim \exp[-\lambda r]/r$ which is obtained for:

$$U(\Phi) = \frac{\lambda}{2}\Phi^2 \quad (4-4)$$

In section 3 it has been stated that the behaviour of a particle sensitive for potential fields is subject to Yang Mills Principle. This principle supposes the existence of a fourvector vector potential $\mathbf{A}(A_0, A_x, A_y, A_z)$ wherein the scalar potential Φ , possibly apart from a proportionality factor, is the very first component A_0 . Therefore a Lagrangian density as defined by (14-1) is incomplete. The full specification requires a description for the production rules for all vectorpotential components and the sources of origin. In addition it requires a test on the local phase invariance on these components. So far, we have only done so for the electromagnetic field (see section 3).

Within the scope of this paper we shall not spend a further discussion on the Proca field, although it would be very insructive and not difficult to handle. The Proca field equations appear not to withstand the local invaiance test. It is therefore not relevant for the thread of this paper.

Instead we wish to discuss rather extensively a potential field which has become known as the Hiiggs field [19,20] Like the Proca field it is a heuristic proposal. It is specified as:

$$\mathcal{L}_g = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\Phi)^2 + U(\Phi) \quad \text{wherein} \quad U(\Phi) = -\frac{1}{2}\mu_c^2\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{4}\lambda_c^2\Phi^4 \quad (4-5)$$

wherein μ_c and λ_c are parameters with real values. Fig.2 shows a comparison of the functional behaviour of the potential energy in the GSW-model (right) and the functional behaviour of the potential energy in the Proca-model (left). ,




Fig. 2: Potential energy as a function of Φ .

Although the Lagrangian density in both cases shows global phase invariance there is a symmetry shift of the minimum value of the Higgs-potential. It is said that *the symmetry is broken*. As we shall see below it is this broken symmetry which will allow local phase invariance for short-range gauge fields. Broken symmetries are not unusual in physics. Examples of broken symmetry are

ferromagnetism and super conductivity. In those cases the properties of the internal electromagnetic fields are changed under the influence of an external energetic influence, in casu under influence of temperature. The permanence of ferromagnetism is lost above the so called Curie-temperature and super conductivity only occurs at cryogenic temperature levels. These phenomena are commonly modelled with heuristic manipulation of electromagnetic laws. In the next section we wish to present a novel analysis of the Higgs field.

5. The Higgs field.

We wish to consider the Higgs field under conditions of rotational symmetry. Application of the Lagrange-Euler equations on the Lagrangian density as given by (4-1) gives:

$$\frac{1}{r} \frac{d^2}{dr^2}(r\Phi) = \frac{d}{d\Phi} U(\Phi) \quad (5-1)$$

so that with (4-5):

$$\frac{1}{r} \frac{d^2}{dr^2}(r\Phi) = -(\mu_c^2 - \lambda_c^2 \Phi^2) \Phi \quad (5-2)$$

This equation is difficult to solve. Rather than expanding the potential function Φ around the local minimum, like done in canonic theory, we wish to follow a different approach. This starts with profiling a tentative solution of (5-2). Let us assume that the solution of (5-2) has a format as:

$$\Phi(r) = \Phi_0 \frac{\exp[-\lambda r]}{\lambda r} \left(\frac{\exp[-\lambda r]}{\lambda r} - 1 \right) \quad (5-3)$$

This may seem an arbitrary guess. Let us explain the reasons for this guess. Recently Ishhi [17,18] has shown a graph for the inter-nucleon potential as he with his team derived from a detailed

numerical mathematical model wherein virtually all knowledge of the present state of canonic particle theory is accomodated. This is shown at the left hand part of fig.3. :




Fig. 3: Potential function of the nucleon doublet as shown by F. Wilczek [17] 7

The right hand part shows the a curve fitting on the basis of (5-3) made by the author of this paper. The curve fits for $\lambda = 1, 224\text{fm}^{-1}$ and $V_0 = 140, 55\text{MeV}$. This curve shows the expected behaviour of a combination of attractive and repulsive forces. It could well be that such a potential does not only fit at the level of the nucleon, but also at the level of a sub-nucleon. This observation will serve as the thread for our strategy to solve (5-2): Instead of solving (5-2) we adopt the spatial format of this Ishhii-potential as a solution and we calculate the functional format of the right-hand part of (5-2) as a consequence of this adoption. So, in mathematical terms:

step 1: From given $\Phi(r)$ we calculate from (5-1) a spatial expression for $dU/d\Phi$.

step 2: We make a parametric plot of $dU/d\Phi$ versus $\Phi(r)$ (elimination of r).

step 3: We apply a curve fit procedure to obtain an polynomial expression for $dU/d\Phi$ as a function of Φ .

step 4: We integrate this expression, so that U as a function of Φ is obtained.

Let us normalise (5-3) as:

$$\eta(\rho) = \frac{\exp[-\rho]}{\rho} \left(\frac{\exp[-\rho]}{\rho} - 1 \right) \quad \text{with } \eta = \Phi/\Phi_0 \quad \text{and } \rho = \lambda r \quad (5-4)$$

The results of the numerical procedure is shown in fig.4. At the upper left $\eta(\rho)$. At the upper right $dU/d\eta$. At the lower left the parametric plot of $dU/d\eta$ vs. η and at the lower right $U(\eta)$. The polynomial fit is:

$$U(\eta) = -A\eta^2 + B\eta^4 \quad \text{with } A = 1,06 \text{ and } B = 32,3 \quad (5-5)$$




Fig. 4: Ishii-potential vs. radius (a), functional derivative of potential energy vs. radius (b), functional derivative of potential energy vs. wave function (c), Ishii-potential vs. wave function (d).

Comparing (5-5) with (4-5), we may state that the heuristic Higgs-potential matches surprisingly well with the heuristic Ishii-potential. It does not mean that both formats are identical: they are just an approximation of each other. There is however no reason why one of the two is the better one. A spatial format, like the Ishii-potential is, is more easily understood in its physical interpretation.

Some explanation is needed for the right hand part of the field equation (5-2). In classic Maxwellian electromagnetic field theory for free space the right hand part of (5-2) is zero, so that the solution of the time-independent wave equation is a Coulomb-field. There is however something odd, that is to say something undefined, with the Coulomb-potential. A zero right-hand part of (5-2) means that no source charge is supposed to be present. This is an oversimplification, because without a source there is no field. What is meant of course is, that there is no source-charge for $r > 0$. But there must be one (with a Dirac-delta pulse-shape) at $r = 0$. So, a time-independent wave equation wherein the right-hand part is spatially expressed is nothing else than Poisson's wave equation with some source for $r \geq 0$. The charge distribution is the one shown in the right

upper part of fig.4 (i.e. $dU/d\eta$). This is rapidly decaying, so effectively zero after a very small value of r .

So, a *monopole* with this source gives a direct electromagnetic interpretation for the Higgs-potential. Therefore, in a monopole concept there is no reason to adopt something like a *Higgs-field from an hypothetical spinless Higgs-particle which gives mass to other particles*, like it is hypothesized in the canonic theory of the *Standard Model*. In spite of efforts over more than forty years, such an Higgs-particle has never been found. So, it is the author's belief that it does not exist, but instead that nuclear forces are carried by pointlike monopoles (quarks), similarly as electromagnetic forces are carried by leptons (electrons). The monopole explanation for the Higgs field gives the same unification of electromagnetic theory and theory for weak interaction as the canonic theory does, but it has the merit that no hypothetical Higgs-particle is needed for this unification. In the subsequent sections of this paper this concept will be further explained.

The explanation will be eased by considering doublet structures of particles. An example of a doublet is the nucleon-doublet, composed by a proton and a neutron. Although these particles are not pointlike, they may be described in terms of wave functions. A proton and a neutron are subject to a combination of short range attracting and repulsive forces such that an equilibrium may occur. The attractive and repulsive forces of two nucleons will bind them together in a stationary position while the two nucleons can be vibrating. As the center of gravity will maintain a static position the system can be conceived as two individual mass-spring systems. So, there is a state of minimum energy with minimum stress on the spring. This minimum state of energy corresponds with a particular amount of spacing between the nucleons. If by a slight force this initial spacing is decreased or increased and subsequently released each of nucleons will start to perform a harmonic oscillation. This harmonic oscillation is subject to quantummechanical laws, so each of the two systems shows a ground state energy and may move to higher states of energy in quantum steps, while the nucleons keep a constant average spacing with respect to each other. This mechanism is the origin of the radiation of bosonic particles, known as pi-mesons. As mentioned in the introduction Yukawa not only predicted the existence of such particles, but was also able to predict a rather accurate estimate of their mass. Like protons and neutrons, these pi-mesons are composite particles, consisting of two quarks. So, there is good reason that doublet structures are not only apparent at the level of composite particles, but at the level of pointlike particles as well.

In particular doublets of particles will be considered under influence of potential fields which enable a stable configuration. As suggested above, this will bring the doublet into a status of har-

monic oscillation, thereby creating conditions for absorption or radiation of bosonic particles alike photons. This is graphically illustrated by fig.5.




Fig. 5: Harmonic oscillation condition of doublets

In the next section we wish to consider doublet structures in more detail.

6. The doublet.

6.1 The wave function doublet

Global phase invariance (and therefore local phase invariance) of a doublet is slightly different from that of a singlet in the sense that it is more than the phase invariance of two individual wave functions. Let us consider the composite Ψ of the doublet, i.e.

$$\Psi = \Psi_a + \Psi_b = (\Psi_{ar} + j\Psi_{ai}) + (\Psi_{br} + j\Psi_{bi}) \quad (6-1)$$

The wave function Ψ can be seen as a vector in a four dimensional space $(\Psi_{ar}, \Psi_{ai}, \Psi_{br}, \Psi_{bi})$. What kind of phase rotation has no influence on the square of its amplitude (being the relevant parameter)? Rather than a phase rotation over a single angle, there are three possible independent angles now. Let us follow the same procedure as with (3-5) to (3-8). Local phase transformation is written as:

$$\Psi = \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)]\Psi', \text{ with } k = 1, 2, 3 \quad (6-2)$$

The covariant derivative has the same format as its argument, so:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \frac{D\Psi'}{\partial x_i} \quad (6-3)$$

The format of this covariant derivative is tentatively supposed to be:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x_i} + jgB_{ki}\Psi \quad (6-4)$$

As compared with (3-7) the coupling factor is renamed as g and the components of the now multiple vector field are renamed as B_{ki} .

If $\vartheta_k(x)$ were a simple constant, the spatial and temporal derivatives would have the format:

$$\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \frac{\partial\Psi'}{\partial x_i} \quad (6-5)$$

But the spatial dependence spoils this simple format for the spatial derivative into:

$$\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial x} = \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \frac{\partial\Psi'}{\partial x} - j \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \Psi' \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \vartheta(x) \quad (6-6)$$

To guarantee compatibility between conditions (6-2), (6-3) and (6-4), the field components B_{ki} have to fulfill the following condition (see appendix):

$$gB_{ki} = gB_{ki}' + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta_k(x) \quad (6-7)$$

This result suggests that a doublet of wave functions shows local phase invariance under influence of an assembly of three gauge fields in the case that these three fields fulfill the gauge condition. The format of the gauge condition is similar to the one for electromagnetic fields in the sense that gauge freedom should exist to add a scalar function to the spatial field vector component.

Stated otherwise: an assembly of three fields of forces is required to let two particles (wave functions) behave as a stationary assembly (doublet). The three fields are subject to an electromagnetic-like gauge condition.

Remark: the reason that three forces come forward, rather than one, is the presupposed degree of freedom of the wave function orientation in Ψ -space. Note that this orientation is not a spatial

one. It can equally apply to a single spatial orientation of the particle assembly as to a three dimensional spatial orientation.

Experimental physics have given evidence of the existence of bosonic particles of three types indeed. At the nucleon level these particles are the mesons. Pi-mesons (pions for short) occur in two charged types: (π^+) and (π^-) a neutral one (π^0). At the subnucleon level three types occur as well: two charged types: W^+ -boson and W^- -boson and a neutral one Z-boson.

6.2 The potential function of a doublet

Let us now consider two particles at a distance d' apart and being subject to a force with a potential field as given by (5-3) and let these particles be responsible for the creation of this field. Let us further suppose that the two particle are aligned along the x' -axis and that the center of the particles is at $x' = 0$.

The result is a potential function of the type:

$$V(x) = f(x+d) + f(d-x) \quad \text{with} \quad f(x) = \frac{\exp[-2x]}{x^2} - \frac{\exp[-x]}{x},$$

wherein: $x = x'/\lambda$ and $d = d'/\lambda$ (6-8)

Fig. 6 shows $V(x)$ as a function of x , with d as parameter. The function shows a clear minimum. As shown in Appendix 1, the minimum occurs for $d = 0, 84$




Fig. 6: Higgs potential as a function of doublet spacing

Furthermore the algebraic analysis of Appendix 1 makes clear that the curve of minimum potential can be approximated as:

$$V(x) = -\frac{1}{2} + k_2 x^2 \quad \text{with } k_2 = 2, 62 \quad (6-9)$$

So, a test particle in the center of the doublet will experience a potential as given by (6-9). This potential is similar to the potential energy of a quantummechanical harmonic oscillator. So, the test particle will behave accordingly. Of course, such a test particle is not physically present. It represents the motion of the vibrating equilibrium of the two particles in the doublet. According to the laws of the harmonic oscillator the energy of the motion can only change in quantum steps. This corresponds with absorption or radiation of virtual particles, i.e. bosons. We may therefore conclude that this model is an elegant interpretation of the origin of such bosons in all kind of doublet structures. The most prominent among these are the nucleon doublet and the meson doublet.

7. The magnetic monopole

So far we have identified something as a nuclear charge having similar properties as electric charge. As subnucleon particles apparently are carriers of both these charge types, these charge types must simultaneously fit in electromagnetic field theory. So, where is the lacuna in the Maxwellian equations which can be used for the purpose? It was Dirac who has pointed to some asymmetry in Maxwell's equations. This asymmetry is the absence of magnetic space charge. This absence in the equations is a consequence of the fact that no experimental physical evidence exists for the existence of such charge. Dirac disliked the asymmetry, so he reformulated Maxwell's equations assuming the existence of an hypothetical magnetic space charge. So Dirac's reformulation is:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{E} &= \rho_e & \nabla \times \mathbf{E} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{B}}{\partial t} &= -\mathbf{J}_m \\ \nabla \cdot \mathbf{B} &= \rho_m & \nabla \times \mathbf{B} - \frac{1}{c} \frac{\partial \mathbf{E}}{\partial t} &= \mathbf{J}_e \end{aligned} \quad (7-1a,b,c,d)$$

These equations are dual, i.e. they remain identical under the following transforms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} &\rightarrow \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{B} &\rightarrow -\mathbf{E} \\ \rho_e, \mathbf{J}_e &\rightarrow \rho_m, \mathbf{J}_m & \rho_m, \mathbf{J}_m &\rightarrow -\rho_e, -\mathbf{J}_e \end{aligned} \quad (7-2a,b,c,d)$$

They are generalizations of Maxwell's equations due to the presence of ρ_m and \mathbf{J}_m . By doing so Dirac had to find an escape route to maintain the concept of the vectorpotential \mathbf{A} , which is defined as:

$$\mathbf{B} = \nabla \times \mathbf{A} \quad (7-3)$$

As the rotation of a vectorfield is divergence free, the concept of vectorpotential seems to be in conflict with the presence of magnetic charge. Dirac showed that the adoption of a singularity offers a way out. The singularity has no physical impact, as it only serves to maintain the abstract mathematical vectorpotential construct in all space apart from the singularity. In order to have a flux from a magnetic pole while not allowing a net flux through a closed surface around the pole (zero divergence) the flux has to be brought in through a singular point on the surface. This does not mean that this mechanism has to exist in physical reality: it has no other purpose than maintaining the mathematical construct of the vectorpotential. This holds for two “worlds”: the normal world wherein the magnetic field is the rotation of the vectorpotential and the dual world wherein the electric field is the rotation of the dual vectorpotential.

By maintaining the vectorpotential concept and by assuming that a magnetic monopole would produce a similar Coulomb-like field as an electric monopole does, Dirac proved that charges of electric as well as magnetic monopoles are quantized. The basic reason can be traced back to the asymmetry between two halves of the enclosed surface around the monopole: one with the singularity and the other without. Dirac has never claimed his analysis as a proof for the existence of magnetic monopoles, but he did not exclude the existence, so that, once found, the discrete characteristics of charged particles have an explanation.

If we do not wish to adopt the existence of elementary discrete particles below the level of quarks, there is no escape from assuming a magnetic field around the quark with two types of magnetic grains: positive and negative. Therefore, unlike as the source of an electric Coulomb field, we can not identify something like an elementary magnetic charge. The resultant of the magnetic field has a short range, which explains that an isolated magnetic monopole has never been found.

The radial magnetic field $B(r)$ can be related with the nuclear field derivative $d\Psi/dr$ by equating the nuclear coupling factor g with the electromagnetic coupling factor. The electromagnetic coupling factor is a dimensionless quantity related with the elementary electric charge q_e via:

$$q_e^2 = 2\varepsilon_0\tilde{h}cg^2 \quad (7-4)$$

In the absence of a magnetic elementary charge the relationship of $B(r)$ with $d\Phi/dr$ has to be established via a relationship with the electric field.

Electromagnetic theory allows to relate physical mass with energy of the electromagnetic field. A non-radiating electromagnetic cloud has energy $W_{em} = m_{em}c^2$ with

$$W_{em} = m_{em}c^2 = \iiint_V \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0 \mathbf{E} \cdot \mathbf{E} dV + \iiint_V \frac{1}{2}\mu_0 \mathbf{H} \cdot \mathbf{H} dV = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_0 \int_{r_e}^{\infty} E_r^2 4\pi r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2\mu_0} \int_{r_e}^{\infty} B^2(r) 4\pi r^2 dr \quad (7-5)$$

The shift of lower integration limit $r = 0$ to $r = r_e$ is a consequence of the *renormalisation issue*. Coulomb fields ($E_r \sim 1/r^2$) would otherwise result into infinite energy. In structure based theories this problem is avoided by assuming an “empty space” for $r > r_e$ and a space with some charge distribution for $r \leq r_e$. In the formalism of QFT this issue is resolved by making a distinction between electromagnetic mass and material mass and considering the finite difference of the infinite contributions of the two at $r = 0$ as observable physical mass. As for an electron both restmass m_e and electric charge q_e are observable and measurable quantities, the so called radius of the electron r_e can be established.

Although it is our aim to relate $B(r)$ with $d\Phi/dr$, we shall first relate $E(r)$ with $d\Phi/dr$ under absence of a magnetic field. We have for the force for an electric particle in an electric field:

$$F_e = q_e E_r \quad (7-6)$$

Analogously we have for nuclear force in a nucleon field:

$$F_n = g \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \quad (7-7)$$

Equating these two forces we get:

$$E_r = \frac{g}{q_e} \frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \quad (7-8)$$

For the energy W_n of the nuclear field W_n , we get from (7-5):

$$W_n = \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon_0 \frac{g^2}{q_e^2} \int \left(\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \right)^2 4\pi r^2 dr \quad (7-9)$$

so that with (7-4):

$$W_n = \frac{\pi}{hc} \int_0^\infty \left(\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \right)^2 r^2 dr \quad (7-10)$$

If we now take the position that no electric energy is present in the cloud, but only magnetic energy we have from (7-10) and (7-5):

$$\frac{\pi}{\hbar c} \int_0^{\infty} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial r} \right)^2 r^2 dr = \frac{1}{2\mu_0} \int_0^{\infty} B^2(r) 4\pi r^2 dr \quad (7-11),$$

so that:

$$B(r) = \sqrt{\varepsilon_0 \mu_0} \frac{g}{q_e} \frac{d\Phi}{dr} = \frac{g}{c q_e} \frac{d\Phi}{dr} \quad (7-12)$$

This expression enables us to give a potential field $\Psi(r)$, if quantitatively expressed in electronvolts, a quantitative interpretation in magnetic quantities. Let us illustrate the significance of this expression. Dirac's monopole theory resulted into the conclusion that:

$$q_e q_m = \frac{n}{2} \hbar c \quad \text{with } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad (7-13)$$

However, the magnetic monopole charge q_m is in fact the total magnetic flux radiated from a Coulomb-like pointsource and is therefore a constant. It is not a constant if the magnetic field is not Coulomb-like, like in our case. Without further proof we memorize that (7-13) in fact has to be reformulated as:

$$\frac{q_e}{\hbar c} \Phi_{\pi}[r] = 2n\pi \quad \text{with } n = 1, 2, 3, \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_{\pi}[r] = 4\pi r^2 B(r) \quad (7-14)$$

From (7-14) and (7-12) it follows that:

$$\frac{2g}{\hbar c} r^2 \frac{d\Phi}{dr} = n \quad \text{wherein } n \text{ is a natural number.} \quad (7-15)$$

As the magnetic pole is granular, we may try to estimate its size. From (...) and (..) it follows that:

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dr} = \lambda \Psi_0 \frac{d\eta}{d\rho} \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{d\eta}{d\rho} = 4\pi\rho \exp[-\rho] \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho}\right) \left(1 - \frac{2\exp[-\rho]}{\rho}\right) \quad (7-16)$$

so that we may write for (7-15):

$$\frac{2g\Phi_0}{\hbar c\lambda} \frac{d\eta}{d\rho} = n \quad (7-14)$$

If we would know figures for λ and Φ_0 we would be able to calculate the radius of the magnetic monopole beyond which no grain can be found.

8. Relationship with canonic theory

In this section we wish to compare the view as outlined above with the canonic view. First of all it has to be noted that so far our view is *Abelian*, as no a-priori field quantization is taken into account. Instead field quantization is a result from the analysis rather than a given fact. This is no conflict in views, because from this point on the *non-Abelian* instruments of field quantization can be taken up to proceed further analysis. This will enable to study particle interactions similarly as in canonic theory.

Theoretical predictions based on the hypothesized Higgs-field are so close to verifications by experiments that its existence has to be regarded to be beyond any doubt. As long as the Maxwellian laws are maintained unchanged, some artificial mechanism is required to explain the origin of the field. This mechanism might be not beyond doubt, in particular as it suggests the existence of a fancy particle subject to an additional wave equation apart from Dirac's equation and the Maxwellian equations. Above we have shown that adaptation of Maxwellian laws by hypothesizing magnetic space charge gives an adequate explanation for the origin of the Higgs field. No fancy extra particle has to be hypothesized, nor any other equations apart from the Maxwellian ones and Dirac's equation.

Where canonic theory heavily relies on the elaboration of one and only Lagrangian density we have applied the Lagrangian density concept so far exclusively for the description of the energetic field, i.e. only for bosonic aspects, while canonic theory uses the Lagrangian density concept for the derivation of the probabilistic quantummechanical wave equation as well. By doing so a composite Lagrangian density can be composed, allowing to apply Feynman's methodology for field and particle interactions. As long as the quantummechanical wave equation is Dirac's wave equation there is no conflict with the view presented in this document as Dirac's equation can be derived from a well defined Lagrangian density. There is no problem whatsoever to modify fig.1 accordingly. See fig. 7. In this scheme the first Lagrangian (the bosonic one) is said to perturb the second Lagrangian (the fermionic one). This scheme allows to take field quantization into account by redefining wave functions as operators on itself with a proper definition of the operation action (i.e. by changing the commutation of position and momentum by non-commutation under restriction of Heisenberg's uncertainty relationship).




Fig. 7: Fields, waves and Lagrangians

So, if it are not these considerations which makes the difference, what else? Let us first consider the case of QED (Quantum Electro Dynamics). This can be comprised by a single Lagrangian density, usually written as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_b + \mathcal{L}_f \quad (8-1)$$

\mathcal{L}_b is the Lagrangian density of a (bosonic) Maxwellian field and \mathcal{L}_f is the Lagrangian density of the (fermionic) Dirac field. Due to the presence of the bosonic field the fermionic wave equation is subject to Yang Mills principle, which expresses that the global phase invariance of the free space fermionic wave function is changed into local phase invariance. This is implemented by changing common derivatives in the fermionic Lagrangian density by covariant derivatives.

Let us now apply this view to the nuclear field. In the magnetic monopole view the bosonic Maxwellian field, and therefore \mathcal{L}_b , is modified by the introduction of magnetic space charge while the fermionic free space wave equation is made subject to Yang Mills principle by making \mathcal{L}_f covariant. As in the case of QED, each particle has bosonic properties as well as fermionic properties. Fig. 7a and 7b shows the correspondence between the QED Lagrangian and the *WFD Lagrangian* ((WFD = Weak Force Dynamics) . In canonic scientific notation the QED Lagrangian reads as:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{16\pi}F^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu} + \bar{\Psi}(j\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - q_e\gamma^\mu A_\mu - m)\Psi \quad (8-2)$$

Note: Greek indices are used for time-space coordinates. The coordinate $\mu, \nu = 0$ is used for the temporal coordinate. The bar in $\bar{\Psi}$ stands for the complex conjugate of the Dirac spinor and γ^μ and γ_μ are the Dirac-Pauli matrices. Upper and lower indices are used according to conventions in covariant expressions. This Lagrangian is the starting point for particle interaction processes according to Feynman's methodology.

In line with the QED Lagrangian we may now formulate the WFD Lagrangian as:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{16\pi}F_{(m)\mu\nu}F_{(m)\mu\nu} - J_{(m)}^\mu A_{(m)\mu} + \bar{\Psi}(j\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - g\gamma^\mu A_\mu - m)\Psi \quad (8-3)$$

The fermionic part is the same as in the QED Lagrangian, but the bosonic part is different. This bosonic part is different from the one in the QED Lagrangian in two aspects. The electromagnetic tensor $F_{(m)\mu\nu}$ is the magnetic equivalent (i.e. the dual) of $F_{\mu\nu}$. Moreover the bosonic part is not sourceless, but contains a source term $J_{(m)}^\mu A_{(m)\mu}$, wherein $J_{(m)\mu}$ is the magnetic current density as a consequence of the non-zero spatial span of the magnetic space charge.




Fig. 8: QED Lagrangian vs. WFD Lagrangian

As the motion of the effective mass reduces to a linear one, the four element Dirac spinor reduces to a two element one: $\Psi(\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$. As we wish to proceed our analysis on the basis of wave equations we may apply the Euler-Lagrange equations on (8-3). Equivalently, but more simply, we

may derive the wave equations from the free space mechanical motion equations, application of the minimum substitution principle and the basic quantummechanical transform of momenta into operators on wave functions. The result of, as invoked from (2-18), is:

$$(\hat{p}_0 - gA_{(m)0})\Psi_2 + (\hat{p}_x - gA_{(m)1})\Psi_1 - jcm\Psi_2 = 0$$

$$(\hat{p}_0 - gA_{(m)0})\Psi_1 - (\hat{p}_x - gA_{(m)1})\Psi_2 + jcm\Psi_1 = 0$$

wherein: $\hat{p}_i = \frac{\tilde{h}}{j} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, $x_1 = x$ and $x_0 = jct$. (8-4)

Modelling the field as in (4-2), i.e. as a scalar field, we have $A_{(m)1} = 0$, so that from (8-4):

$$(\hat{p}_0 - gA_{(m)0})\Psi_2 + \hat{p}_x\Psi_1 - jcm\Psi_2 = 0$$

$$(\hat{p}_0 - gA_{(m)0})\Psi_1 - \hat{p}_x\Psi_2 + jcm\Psi_1 = 0 \quad (8-5)$$

Under suitable conditions this set of equations may have stationary solutions. Such solutions can be found from (8-5) by imposing time independency on $\Psi(\Psi_1, \Psi_2)$, which modifies the set (8-5) into:

$$\hat{p}_x\Psi_1 - (jcm + gA_{(m)0})\Psi_2 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{p}_x\Psi_2 - (jcm - gA_{(m)0})\Psi_1 = 0 \quad (8-6)$$

To simplify the problem even further spin can be ignored. In the Side Note, annexed to this paper, it is derived that the spinless limit of Dirac's equation is:

$$j\tilde{h}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\tilde{h}^2}{m_0}\frac{\partial^2\Psi}{\partial x^2} - \{c^2 + V(x)\}\Psi = 0 \quad (8-7)$$

which reduces in the non-relativistic limit to:

$$j\tilde{h}\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\tilde{h}^2}{2m_0}\frac{\partial^2\Psi}{\partial x^2} - V(x)\Psi = 0 \quad (8-8)$$

The time-independent form is the wave equation of an harmonic oscillator. That means that we have a straight path from the full mathematical format to a mathematical expression of a comprehensible physical system. This format will allow us to arrive at some novel insights to be discussed in next section.

9. Further evidence: the leptonic algorithm

What kind of experimental evidence can be brought forward to support the theory as presented above? Well, first of all we could invoke Occam's razor. It states that if two theories result in identical outcomes, the more simple of the two is the correct one. Well, inclusion of magnetic space charge in Maxwell's equations is simpler than the adoption of a additional phantom particle. The disclaimer of course is that the subject is not dealt with in sufficient detail to claim that the experimental results following from the novel view are indetical with those of the canonic theory indeed.

Secondly, we could bring forward a negative outcome of a proof: the Higgs particle has not been found so far. The disclaimer is that possibly the energies of present colliders have not been high enough to disclose its existence. Even if the LHC will not be able to disclose it, the search will probably be continued.

Thirdly, quantization of charge and consequently quantization of fields is an outcome of the theory in stead of an axiom like it is in canonic theory. Also here we have a disclaimer: the magnetic monopole grain is too small to be verifiable.

If there would be any new predictive value in the theory while maintaining experimental results of the canonic theory, the theory would be superior if the predictive value can be experimentally verified. Is there some?

Let us consider the doublet potential of fig. 6 once more. Suppose that a quantum leap brings the doublet in a state of higher energy. As will be obvious from the graph, the higher state corresponds with a stronger curvature of the potential function, so a next quantum leap will correspond with an even stronger curvature. This implies that the quantum steps in the doublet's potential function will not show a constant spacing, but a progressive spacing instead. Let us try to give an estimating calculation of this spacing.

From the parabolic approximation of the potential function we have (see appendix and 6-9):

$$\frac{\Phi(r)}{\Phi_0} = -k_0 + k_2(r\lambda)^2 \quad (9-1)$$

The second term of the right hand part can be identified as the potential energy of an harmonically oscillating unknown effective doublet mass m_p . Relating stiffness and frequency as usual we may equate:

$$\frac{1}{2}m_p\omega^2 = \Phi_0k_2\lambda^2 \quad (9-2)$$

The energetic state of the harmonic oscillator is subject to stepwise changes by the amount of $\tilde{h}\omega$. Let us identify these changes as bosonic masses m_W . So:

$$m_W c^2 = \tilde{h}\omega \quad (9-3)$$

For convenience we wish to express relevant parameters in terms of electronvolts rather than in joule, so we define:

$$m'_W = m_W c^2 \quad \text{and similarly } m'_p \quad (9-4)$$

From (9-1) - (9-4) we get:

$$\Phi_0 = \frac{m'_p m'^2_W}{2(\tilde{h}c)^2 k_2 \lambda^2} \quad (9-5)$$

If we assume near-light velocity of the virtual interaction bosons we may go a step further. In that case we may state that:

$$2d \approx c\Delta t, \quad (9-6)$$

wherein d is the half-spacing between the quark constituents of the doublet. Applying Heisenberg's relationship $E\Delta t \geq \tilde{h}$ for virtual particles getting energy E within the uncertainty interval Δt we get under consideration of (9-3):

$$m'_W = \alpha \frac{\tilde{h}c}{2d} \quad (9-7)$$

wherein a factor α with order of magnitude of 1 is inserted to correct for boson velocity lower than the light velocity and for the inexactness of the Heisenberg relationship.

Substitution of this value into (9-5) gives:

s

$$\Phi_0 = \frac{\alpha^2 m'_p}{8(\lambda d)^2 k_2} \quad (9-9)$$

From (9-1) we note that potential function $\Phi(0)$ for generic spacing is written as:

$$\Phi(0) = \Phi_0 \{k_0(d') + k_2(d')\} \quad (9-10)$$

wherein $d' = d\lambda$ and where, as shown in appendix B,

$$k_0 = 2\left(\frac{\exp[-2d']}{d'^2} - \frac{\exp[-d']}{d'}\right) \quad (9-11)$$

$$\text{and } k_2 = \frac{\exp[-2d']}{d'^4}(6 + 4d'^2 + 8d') - \frac{\exp[-d']}{d'^2}\left(2 + d' + \frac{2}{d'}\right) \quad (9-12)$$

Minimum potential occurs for $x = 0$ and $k_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ at $d_0' = 0,84$, so that $k_2(d_0') = 2,62$

Let us now shift the potential by an amount of $\frac{3}{2}\tilde{h}\omega = \frac{3}{2}m'_W$ and calculate the new curvature $k_2(d_a')$.

This gives the following condition:

$$\Phi_0 k_0(d_0') + \frac{3}{2}m'_W = \Phi_0 k_0(d_a') \quad (9-13)$$

Defining a parameter p as:

$$p = \frac{m'_W}{\alpha^2 m'_p} \quad (9-15)$$

we get for (9-13) under consideration of (9-9):

$$k_0(d_0') + 12p d_0'^2 k_2(d_0') = k_0(d_a') \quad (9-14)$$

If the parameter p would be known, the spacing d_a' can be calculated from d_0' . Subsequently the calculation can be recursively repeated to calculate an even higher-energy spacing. Similarly so, the hierarchical values for the curvature k_2 can be established from (9-10).

In the case of the doublet archetype, i.e. the meson, all energy radiates in a boson. Therefore the vibrating mass m_p and the radiative mass m_W are closely related. Their semantics are different because m_p is considered as non-virtual and m_W as virtual. They may be at different scales of magnitude. This is due to the fact that radiative mass m_W represents binding energy, only existing within the time interval of the Heisenberg uncertainty relationship. So, analysis of the harmonic oscillator has either to be made in the domain of the vibrating mass or in the domain of the radia-

tive mass. As they show up in a ratio it does not matter which domain is chosen. We may then simply state that m_W and m_p are of the same of order of magnitude, which makes the parameter p , under consideration of the meaning of α :, of the order of magnitude 1.

Calculation of the first level for the hierarchical spacing above the spacing of minimum energy with $p = 0,35$ gives $d_a' = 0,30$ and a ratio $k_2(d_a')/k_2(d_0')$ of 200. Interpretation of this result in terms of (9-2) implies a 200x increase of effective mass m_p for constant ω . So, if the mass at minimum energy is pure electromagnetic mass, the new electromagnetic mass is 200 times larger. If this condensates, we would have a particle with 200 times the mass of the particle in ground state. This ratio corresponds with the mass ratio of an electron and a muon. A different value for p would give a different ratio, so the result is somewhat “manipulated”. Nevertheless the value $p = 0,35$ is reasonable, as will be further explained below.

In this calculation it is assumed that this first leap spans the level of minimum energy with the first escape level at a value of the equivalence of $3/2 \tilde{h}\omega$. What about the second leap? Let us inspect the behaviour of a one-dimensional quantummechanical oscillator in terms of the Schrodinger equation, so as:

$$-\frac{\tilde{h}^2}{2m_p} \frac{d^2 \Psi}{dr^2} + V(r)\Psi = E\Psi, \quad (9-16)$$

wherein we have, as discussed above, : $V(r) = \Phi_0(k_0 + k_2 r^2 \lambda^2)$

This equation has solutions for discrete values of $(E - k_0)$ only, i.e. for

$$E_n = k_0 \Phi_0 + \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \tilde{h}\omega = \Phi_0 \left\{ k_0 + \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{m'_W}{\Phi_0} \right\} \quad (9-17)$$

From (9-9) and (9-14) it follows that:

$$\frac{m'_W}{\Phi_0} = 8pd^2 k_2 \quad (9-18)$$

so that

$$E_n = \Phi_0 \left\{ k_0 + \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) 8pd^2 k_2 \right\} \quad (9-19)$$

and therefore:

$$E_0 = \Phi_0 \left\{ k_0(d_0') + \frac{1}{2} 8pd_0'^2 k_2(d_0') \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad E_1 = \Phi_0 \left\{ k_0(d_0') + \frac{3}{2} 8pd_0'^2 k_2(d_0') \right\} \quad (9-20)$$

At the value E_1 the oscillator may jump in the ground state of a different mode as we may equate:

$$k_0(d_0') + \frac{3}{2} 8pd_0'^2 k_2(d_0') = k_0(d_1') + \frac{1}{2} 8pd_1'^2 k_2(d_1') \quad (9-21)$$

So, if p would be known, we may calculate from (9-20) the shift from d_0' to d_1' , which establishes a narrower doublet distance for harmonic oscillation in ground mode. In fig. 9 the process is illustrated. It clarifies the meaning of the distance parameters d_0' , d_a' and d_1' . The parameters d_0' and d_1' determine the “bottom levels” of the potential curves, while the parameters d_a' and d_b' determine the “take-over levels” of the modes. These levels can also be seen as “escape levels” for radiation/absorption of bosons. The mechanism of take-over is further illustrated by the right hand part of the figure. It shows a construction of two bowls, each representing a potential curve. The vibration can be seen as a ball with some rotation energy which can smoothly move from the lower bowl into the upper bowl. The reason why the left graph does not show a similar smooth take over is due to the mass leap to maintain a constant value for $m_w c^2 = \tilde{h}\omega$ (see 9-17).

How to interpret these results? Electromagnetic particles are subject to electric fields and magnetic fields. In classic theory magnetic fields are absent in motionless conditions. In the theory as presented above magnetic fields are present at short range in static conditions. So, a stationary doublet of electromagnetic particles may exist. In minimum energy condition these two particles are inseparable. If separated and at large distance apart they are not subject to any interaction. One constituent of the doublet after separation carries the electric field: it is the electron and its mass is determined by the electric field. The other constituent is the (electron) neutrino and carries the magnetic field. As this magnetic field is of short range, no substantial energy is captured by this field. Therefore the neutrino mass is virtually zero.

The electromagnetic doublet may be subject to external forces which may bring the doublet in higher states of energy. These levels of energy are spaced in quantum steps. The first hierarchical level is known as a doublet of quark and antiquark, known as meson. In separated condition one of the constituents is the packet of electric energy (muon) and the other is the (muon) neutrino. The electric packet decays into smaller electric packets (electrons). The separation of the muon is the annihilation process of the quark and antiquark which is facilitated by the virtual quantized format of the electromagnetic energy (boson).




Fig. 9: Quantum leaps of the Higgs field

Above we have adopted a value $p = 0,35$ to explain the mass ratio of 200 for electrons and muons. A computation of the new doublet spacing for the second mode for $p = 0,35$ yields a figure of $d_1' = 0,65$. This is different from a doublet spacing of 0,50 which would result in ratio of 18 for tauons and muons. Unfortunately the k_2 ratio is rather sensitive for the parameter p . In fact the spacing $d_1' = 0,65$ appears to correspond with a ratio of 4,8 only. What is the reason of this discrepancy? The explanation has to do with the simple first order modelling of the potential curves by a second order function of the coordinate. This enabled us to apply the theory of a linear harmonic quantummechanical oscillator. By expanding the potential curve to a higher order one might expect that the characteristics of the quantum leaps remain discrete, but will be subject to other spacing rules. So, it remains a challenge to refine the computation in an attempt to bring the theoretical closer to the values as found experimentally. It will require to model the oscillator as an anharmonic quantumoscillator, which is possible to do, but requires rather complex computations [21,22]. The table of fig. 10 shows our computational results for the (too) simple harmonic model. These results are fair enough to believe that our theory explains the differences and correspondences between leptons indeed, but is, unfortunately inadequate to predict the mass of the leptons beyond the tauon with some accuracy.

Nevertheless we wish to conclude that the qualitative explanation as given above reveals the existence of a leptonic algorithm. It also makes the very nature of the neutrino less mysterious.

spacings				
d_0'	d_1'	d_a'	d_2'	d_b'
0,84	0,65 (0,5)	0,30		0,21

k_2 -ratios		
$k_2(d_a')/k_2(d_0')$	$k_2(d_a')/k_2(d_0')$	$k_2(d_b')/k_2(d_1')$
1	200	4,8 (18)

lepton masses		
0,5 MeV/c ²	100 MeV/c ²	1800 MeV/c ²

Fig. 10: Computational results for $p = 0,35$

10. Conclusions

In the views as outlined in this paper we have taken the existence of the Higgs field as an undeniable starting point. We have however challenged the origin of the field. Rather than ascribing the origin of it to a yet undiscovered phantom particle, we have ascribed the origin directly to electromagnetic energy, in particular as magnetic charge next to electric charge of elementary pointlike particles. To this end we have used two instruments. The first one is the transform of the Higgs field from a functional description into a spatial description, without changing the basic properties. This is, as far as the author knows, not done before. The other instrument is as old as 1931. It is the concept of the magnetic monopole, as introduced by Dirac. The two instruments fit well together. In the paper it is shown that the particular field of the monopole as imposed by the Higgs field has prevented its experimental verification. As is well known from the work of Dirac, one of the consequences of the magnetic monopole is the discretization of electric charge. The results of all of this is that electromagnetic energy on its own is the source of all mass. It implies that the search after the Higgs particle will remain fruitless. No other equations, apart from Maxwell's Equations and Dirac's Equation are required to express the fundamentals of quantum waves and quantum fields, which makes the disputed Klein Gordon Equation obsolete. We have also shown that the theory as developed along these lines does not only make the neutrino less mysterious, but it also reveals an algorithm to explain the ratios between the lepton masses. In that sense the theory shows a predictive element, while grosso modo, as shown, no derogation is done to the results and instruments of canonic theory.

References

- [1] P. Higgs . "Broken Symmetries and the Masses of Gauge Bosons", Physical Review Letters 13:, (1964) p. 508
- [2] S.L. Glashow, "Partial symmetries of weak interactions", Nucl. Phys. 22 (1961) 579-588
- [3] J. Goldstone, A. Salam and S. Weinberg, "Broken Symmetries", Phys. Rev. 127 (1962) 965-
- [5] G. 'tHooft, M. J.G. Veltman, "Regularization and Renormalization of Gauge Fields", Nucl. Phys. B44 (1972) 189-213.
- [6] H. Lyre: "Does the Higgs Mechanism exist?", International Studies in the Philosophy of Science, June 2008
- [7] P. A. M. Dirac, "Quantised Singularities in the Electromagnetic Field", Proc. R. Soc. A 133 (1931) 60.
- [8] A. Proca, "Sur la theorie ondulatoire des electrons positifs et negatifs", J. Phys. Radium 7, 347 (1936); Sur la theorie du positon, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 202, 1366 (1936).
- [9] H. Yukawa, "On the interaction of elementary particles I", Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan 17, 48 (1935).
- [10] C.N. Yang, R. Mills, "Conservation of isotopic Spin and isotopic Gauge Invariance", Phys. Rev. 96 (1954) 191-195.
- [11] P. Dirac, "The Quantum Theory of the Electron", Proc.R.Soc.Lond. A117 610-624; *ibid* **A118** 351-361 (1928)
- [12] L.M. Brown, Feynman's Thesis, a new Approach to Quantum Theory, ISBN 978-981-256-366-8, World Scientific Publishing Company, 2005
- [13] E. Comay, "Further difficulties with the Klein Gordon Equation", Apeiron, Vol.12, No.1, Jan. 2005
- [14] E. Comay, Apeiron, Vol.11, No. 3, p.1 (2004).
- [15] E. Comay, Apeiron, , Vol.14, No. 1, p. 1 (2007).
- [16] E. Comay, Apeiron, Vol. 14, No.2, p. 50 (2007).
- [17] F. Wilczek, Nature 445, 156-157, Jan. 2007
- [18] Ishii, Aoki and T. Hatsuda, Phys. Review Letter 99, 022001 (2007)
- [19] F. Scheck: "Successes and Mysteries of the Standard Model in Particle Physics", San Jose lectures, summer 2003, p.35, <http://wwthep.physik.uni-mainz.de/~scheck>
- [20] M. Holler: "Die Suche nach dem Higgs-Boson", http://web.physik.rwth-aachen.de/~mnich/SeminarWS0203/V9a_MatthiasHoeller.pdf
- [21] Won-San Chung et al., "Relation between the Quantum Algebra and the Anharmonic Oscillator Problem", Journal Korean Phys. Soc., Vol.27, No.1, Feb. 1994, p. 117-119
- [22] V. Barsan, "Hsue-Chern Approach to the Quantum Anharmonic Oscillator", Romanian Reports in Physics, Vol.60, No,2, pp.205-224, (2008)

Appendix A: Covariant derivative for local phase invariance

From (3-6) and (3-7) we have:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta(x)] \frac{D\Psi'}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta(x)] \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \Psi' + jqA_i' \Psi' \right\} \quad (\text{A-1})$$

From (3-8) and (3-5):

$$\exp[-j\vartheta(x)] \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \Psi' = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_i} + j\Psi \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta(x) \quad (\text{A-2})$$

Substitution of (A-2) into (A-1) gives:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_i} + j\Psi \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta(x) + jqA_i' \exp[-j\vartheta(x)] \Psi' \quad (\text{A-3})$$

From (A-3) and (8-7) it follows that:

$$qA_i = qA_i' + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta(x) \quad (\text{A-4})$$

From (10-) and (10-) we have:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \frac{D\Psi'}{\partial x_i} = \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \Psi' + jgB_{ki}' \Psi' \right\} \quad (\text{A-5})$$

From (10-) and (10-):

$$\exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \Psi' = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_i} + j\Psi \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta_k(x) \quad (\text{A-6})$$

Substitution of (A-6) into (A-5) gives:

$$\frac{D\Psi}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_i} + j\Psi \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta_k(x) + jgB_{ki}' \exp[-j\vartheta_k(x)] \Psi' \quad (\text{A-7})$$

From (A-7) and (10-) it follows that:

$$gB_{ki} = gB_{ki}' + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \vartheta_k(x) \quad (\text{A-8})$$

Appendix B: Expansion of the Ishii-potential

$$V(x) = f(x+d) + f(d-x) \quad \text{with } f(x) = \frac{\exp[-2x]}{x^2} - \frac{\exp[-x]}{x}$$

$$V(x) = g_2(x) - g_1(x)$$

$$\begin{aligned} g_2(x) &= \frac{\exp[-2(x+d)]}{(x+d)^2} + \frac{\exp[-2(d-x)]}{(x-d)^2} = \frac{(d-x)^2 \exp[-2(x+d)] + (x+d)^2 \exp[-2(d-x)]}{(d^2 - x^2)^2} \\ &= \frac{\exp[-2d]}{(d^2 - x^2)^2} \{ (x^2 - 2dx + d^2) \exp[-2x] + (x^2 + 2dx + d^2) \exp[2x] \} \\ &= \frac{\exp[-2d]}{(d^2 - x^2)^2} \{ (x^2 + d^2) (\exp[-2x] + \exp[2x]) + 2dx (\exp[2x] - \exp[-2x]) \} \\ &\approx \frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^4} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{d^2} + \frac{x^4}{d^4} \right) \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{d^2} + \frac{x^4}{d^4} \right) \left\{ (x^2 + d^2) \left(2 + 4x^2 + \frac{4}{3}x^4 \right) + 8dx^2 + \frac{8}{3}dx^4 \right\} \\ &\approx \frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^4} \left(1 + \frac{2x^2}{d^2} + \frac{3x^4}{d^4} \right) \left\{ 2d^2 + x^2(2 + 4d^2 + 8d) + x^4 \left(4 + \frac{4}{3}d^2 + \frac{8}{3}d \right) \right\} \\ &\approx \frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^4} \left\{ 2d^2 + x^2(2 + 4d^2 + 8d) + 4x^2 + x^4 \left(4 + \frac{4}{d^2} + \frac{4}{3}d^2 + \frac{8}{3}d \right) + \frac{2x^4}{d^2} (2 + 4d^2 + 8d) + 6\frac{x^4}{d^2} \right\} \\ &\approx \frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^4} \left\{ 2d^2 + x^2(6 + 4d^2 + 8d) + x^4 \left(12 + \frac{10}{d^2} + \frac{16}{d} + \frac{4}{3}d^2 + \frac{8}{3}d \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1(x) &= \frac{(d-x)\exp[-(x+d)] + (x+d)\exp[-(d-x)]}{d^2-x^2} \approx \\
&\approx \frac{\exp[-d]}{d^2-x^2} \{d(\exp[-x] + \exp[x]) + x(\exp[-x] - \exp[x])\} \\
&\approx \frac{\exp[-d]}{d^2-x^2} \left\{ d\left(2 + x^2 + \frac{x^4}{12}\right) + 2x^2 + \frac{x^4}{3} \right\} \\
&\approx \frac{\exp[-d]}{d^2} \left(1 + \frac{x^2}{d^2} + \frac{x^4}{d^4}\right) \left\{ d(2+x^2) + 2x^2 + x^4\left(\frac{d}{12} + \frac{1}{3}\right) \right\} \\
&\approx \frac{\exp[-d]}{d^2} \left\{ 2d + x^2\left(2 + d + \frac{2}{d}\right) + x^4\left(\frac{2}{d^3} + \frac{2}{d^2} + \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{d}{12}\right) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

so:
$$V(x) = g_2(x) - g_1(x) = k_0 + k_2x^2 + k_4x^4 + \dots$$

with
$$k_0 = 2\left(\frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^2} - \frac{\exp[-d]}{d}\right)$$

$$k_2 = \frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^4}(6 + 4d^2 + 8d) - \frac{\exp[-d]}{d^2}\left(2 + d + \frac{2}{d}\right)$$

$$k_4 = \frac{\exp[-2d]}{d^4}\left(\frac{10}{d^2} + \frac{16}{d} + 12 + \frac{8}{3}d + \frac{4}{3}d^2\right) - \frac{\exp[-d]}{d^2}\left(\frac{2}{d^3} + \frac{2}{d^2} + \frac{1}{d} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{d}{12}\right)$$

Side Note: The relativistic wave equation under neglect of spin.

The development of a spinless limit for Dirac's equation starts by observation of the equation set (2-18). Let Ψ_1 be dominant over Ψ_2 . This implies a small value for the energy of Ψ_2 and therefore a small value for the influence for the term with the operator \hat{p}_0 in (2-18a) as compared with $j m_0 c \Psi_2$. So, under the condition that:

$$\hat{p}_0 \Psi_2 \ll j m_0 c \Psi_2 \text{ (2-18a) reduces to: } \hat{p}_x \Psi_1 \approx j m_0 c \Psi_2 \quad (2-26)$$

After substitution of (2-26) into (2-18b) and subsequent evaluation we get after identifying Ψ_1 as Ψ .

$$j \tilde{h} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\tilde{h}^2}{m_0} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x^2} - c^2 \Psi = 0 \quad (2-27)$$

The non-relativistic limit of solutions of this equation appear to be solutions of Schrodinger's Equation:

$$j \tilde{h} \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} + \frac{\tilde{h}^2}{2m_0} \frac{\partial^2 \Psi}{\partial x^2} = 0. \quad (2-28)$$

Note the difference of a factor 2 in the second right hand term of both equations.

Evidently (2-27) is a valid relativistic version of Schrodinger's Equation. It does not show the flaws of the seriously disputed Klein-Gordon Equation [13,14,15,16] as, according to Dirac's requirement for positive definiteness, the temporal derivative is of first order, thereby obeying the condition for positive definiteness. The very reason for the difference with the Klein-Gordon Equation is the unjustified generalization of the basic hypothesis of quantummechanics, as formulated in (2-3), of transforming the square of a momentum into a second order differential quotient on a wave function as done in the derivation of the Klein Gordon Equation.