

THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF MATTER

Mário Everaldo de Souza

THE GENERAL STRUCTURE
OF MATTER

Mário Everaldo de Souza
(e-mail mdesouza@ufs.br)
Departamento de Física
Universidade Federal de Sergipe

Reproduction of this book, limited to a small number of copies, is allowed for scientific purposes and forbidden for other purposes. Further information and requests should be addressed to the author at
Departamento de Física
Universidade Federal de Sergipe
Campus Universitário
49100-000 São Cristóvão, Sergipe
Brasil
e-mail mdesouza@sergipe.ufs.br

Cataloging by Main Library of Universidade Federal de Sergipe

S719s Souza, Mário Everaldo de, 1954 -
The General Structure of Matter
- São Cristóvão: Departamento de Física,
Universidade Federal de Sergipe, 2001.

1. General Principles of Physics. 2. Fundamental Interactions. 3. Hadrons, Quarks and Prequarks.
4. Quark Masses. 5. Masses of Hadrons.
6. Structure of the Nucleon. 7. The Nucleon Sea.
8. Nuclear Forces. 9. Galactic Evolution.
10. Rotation of Galaxies. 11. Universal Expansion.
12. Structure Formation. 13. The Fifth Force.

Dedicated to the memory of Sir Isaac Newton
for his genius and for his humility.

“I do not know what I may appear to the world;
but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy
playing on the seashore, and diverting myself in
now and then finding a smoother pebble or prettier
shell than ordinary, while the great ocean of truth
lay all undiscovered before me”.

Sir Isaac Newton

Preface

This work intends to be just the tip of the iceberg that is concealed beneath the present theoretical status quo. I do apologize beforehand if any due reference was omitted. If it was, it was not done by mischievousness, but by ignorance. Last year (Science, April 2000) and this year (Science, January 2001) the Boo-merang experiment reported that the Universe began with an initial mass. It is important to have in mind that in 1995, in the work *The Six Fundamental Forces of Nature*, on top of p. 22, I said that **“Each cycle of the Universe begins(t=0) with a certain volume of neutrons, protons and electrons at a temperature of about 1 MeV, which is necessary for the primordial formation of the light elements”**. Also, in the work *The Superstrong, Strong and Superweak Interactions*, of April 2000, on p. 47, 2nd paragraph I said **“It is quite remarkable the similarity between a supernova explosion and the Big Bang. In supernova debris we find sheets and filaments of gas, and underdense and overdense regions. We find the same in the large scale structure of the Universe: sheets, filaments and voids. There are other similarities. In supernova debris we find shells of gas expanding at speeds in the range $(10^3 - 10^4)km/s$. There are also shells in the Universe. As di Nella and Paturel show “The distribution of galaxies up to a distance of 200Mpc (650 million light-years) is flat and shows a structure like a shell roughly centered on the Local Supercluster (Virgo Cluster). This result clearly confirms the existence of the hypergalactic large scale structure noted in 1988. This is presently the largest structure ever seen”. This is so because both explosions, either in supernovae or in the Universe, are caused by the same force: THE SUPERSTRONG FORCE”**.

The fundamental idea of this work is that Nature has six fundamental forces. This implies that a quark is a composite structure formed by primons. It is shown in this work that primons form quarks, supergluons, gluons and Higgs bosons. They are thus related to the deepest essence of matter. With them we can explain the sizes of baryons, the sizes of quarks and the nucleon sea. And we can understand the origin of the harmonic effective potentials used in the calculation of hadron spectra. And finally the proposal makes the bridge from quarks to nuclear physics in a rather consistent way.

In this work almost all energy levels of baryons are calculated in an easy way taking into account angular momentum, and the bound states of heavy mesons are explained. Other considerations on mesons are included.

Some important results on formation and evolution of galaxies are presented

and their connection with the superstrong interaction is stressed. Some cosmic and planetary evidences are shown on the existence of such interaction. It is shown that this interaction avoids the formation of black holes and plays a role in the formation of planets and stars.

It is clearly shown that nature has a generalized structured state which is manifested in four different ways, and is characterized by a fermion charge carrier (not interaction carrier which is a boson) and is always formed by two different fundamental forces. From this we arrive at very important results concerning the quantization of gravity.

In 1999 and 2000 several works were published on quintessence which is actually a disguise for another field. Since 1991 I have proposed that Fischbach's fifth force acts among galaxies and together with gravity makes the galactic medium. The present book reinforces this proposal and shows the connection between neutrinos and the superweak interaction.

I would like to pay homage to David Schramm because I began to construct Tables 1.1 and 1.2 (which gave origin to the rest of this work) just after a talk that he gave at the University of Illinois at Chicago in 1989. In the talk he showed the work of de Lapparent et al. of 1986 and the fresh work, at that moment, of Broadhurst et al., both on the distribution of galaxies. He stressed then that both works were very disturbing. After the talk I suggested that there could be another force acting between galaxies and he replied in a humble way: "It is possible. It is a possible line of thought." Unfortunately, this open-mindedness is rare in physics. Thus, this work is also dedicated to his memory.

I emphasize once more that this work is just the tip of the iceberg and therefore it has some qualitative results simply because we still have to develop a theory on the new interactions.

It is quite odd that some critics do not accept the possibility of Nature having six forces but accept, instead, extra dimensions, dark matter and its array of strange particles, unification at any cost, inflation, neutrino oscillations, and so on.

Aracaju, July 2001.

Mário Everaldo de Souza

e-mail mdesouza@ufs.br

Contents

1	General Properties of Matter	
1.1	General Classification of Matter	10
1.2	Size and Number	13
2	Prequarks, Quarks and Nucleons	
2.1	Prequarks and the Number of Quarks	15
2.2	The Structure of Nucleons, the Sizes of Quarks u and d, and the Stability of the Proton	18
2.3	The Sizes of Quarks, Primon Mass, and Generation of Quark Mass (by Higgs Bosons)	20
2.4	The Seas and Sizes of Nucleons	27
2.4.1	The Proton Sea Content	27
2.4.2	The Neutron Sea Content	31
2.4.3	The Contribution of Both Seas to the Structure Functions	31
3	The Strong, Superstrong and Higgs Bosons, Gluons and Interactions Between Primons	
3.1	The Higgs Bosons	35
3.2	The Bosons of the Strong and Superstrong Interactions	36
3.3	The Nature of Gluons	38
3.4	The Interaction Matrix Between Primons of Different Quarks with Different Supercolors	40
3.5	The Lagrangian of Quantum Superchromodynamics	42
3.6	Primons and Weak Interactions	42

4	Some Topics of QCD	
4.1	The Potential of a Quark Pair and the Usual QCD Potential	44
4.2	The Confining Term of the Usual QCD Potential	46
4.3	Asymptotic Freedom	47
5	The Energies and Sizes of Hadrons	
5.1	The Energies of Baryons	51
5.1.1	In Cartesian Coordinates	52
5.1.2	In Polar Coordinates	61
5.1.3	Relation Between Energy and Angular Momentum	68
5.1.4	The Sizes of Baryons	68
5.1.5	Spin-Orbit Interaction	71
5.2	Generalization of the Gell-Mann-Okubo Mass Formula	72
5.3	The Bound States of Mesons	76
5.3.1	Heavy Mesons	77
5.3.2	Light Mesons	80
5.3.3	The Sizes of Mesons	84
6	The Superstrong Force and the Universe	
6.1	The Supernovae Evidence for the Superstrong Interaction	87
6.2	The Formation and Evolution of Galaxies	89
6.2.1	The Formation of Galaxies and Primordial Stars	89
6.2.2	The Evolution of Galaxies	91
6.3	The Formation of Structure: Voids, Sheets and Clusters	96
6.4	No need of (for) Dark Matter	96
6.5	The Expansion of the Universe and the Background Radiation	97
6.6	The Planetary Evidence for the Superstrong Interaction	98
6.7	The Rotation of Spiral Galaxies	98
6.8	Black Holes Do Not Exist	101

7	Associated Fermions and the Hidden Realm of Gravity	
7.1	Associated Fermions and the Dual Role of Neutrinos	104
7.2	The Hidden Realm of Gravity	108
8	Properties of the Galactic Structured State	
8.1	The Superweak Force and its Connection to Neutrinos	112
8.2	The Galactic Medium is a Strange ‘Metal of Clusters of Galaxies and Neutrinos’	115
8.3	Properties of the Neutrino Gas of the Universe	116
8.4	Neutrino Levels in a Weak Periodic Potential	118
8.4.1	Neutrino Energy Bands in One Dimension	121
9	Another Solution to the Solar Neutrino Problem	
9.1	The Solar Neutrino Problem and its Current Solution	125
9.2	Another Solution to the Solar Neutrino Problem	126
10	Some Topics in Nuclear Physics	
10.1	The Nuclear Potential and the Stability of the Deuteron, Triton and Alpha Particle	130
10.2	The Absence of Nuclides with $A=5$ and the Instability of Be^8	134
	Appendix: Brief Vita	135

1 General Properties of Matter

1.1 General Classification of Matter

Science has utilized specific empirical classifications of matter which have revealed hidden laws and symmetries. Two of the most known classifications are the Periodic Table of the Elements and Gell-Mann's classification of particles (which paved the way towards the quark model). Let us go on the footsteps of Mendeleev and let us attempt to achieve a general classification of matter, including all kinds of matter formed along the universal expansion, and by doing so we may find the links between the elementary particles and the large bodies of the universe.

It is well known that the different kinds of matter appeared at different epochs of the universal expansion and that they are imprints of the different sizes of the universe along the expansion. Taking a closer look at the different kinds of matter we may classify them as belonging to two distinct general states. One state is characterized by a single unit with angular momentum. The angular momentum may either be the intrinsic angular momentum, spin, or the orbital angular momentum. The other state is characterized by some degree of correlation among the interacting particles and may be called the structured state. The angular momentum may (or may not) be present in this state. The fundamental units of matter make the structured states, that is, they are the building blocks of everything, *stepwise*. In what follows we will not talk about the weak force since it does not form any stable matter and is rather related to instability in matter. Along the universal expansion nature made different building blocks and different media to fill space. The weak force did not form any building block and is out of our discussion. As is well known this force is special in many other ways. For example, it violates parity and has no "effective

potential” (or static potential) as the other interactions do. Besides, the weak force is known to be left-handed, that is, particles experience this force only when their spin direction is anti-aligned with their momentum. Right-handed particles appear to experience no weak interaction, although, if they have electric charge, they may still interact electromagnetically. Later on we will include the weak force into the discussion. Each structured state is mainly formed by two types of fundamental forces. Due to the interactions among the units one expects other kinds of forces in the structured state. In this fashion we can form a chain from the quarks to the galactic superstructures and extrapolate at the two ends towards the constituents of quarks and towards the whole Universe.

The units of matter are the nucleons, the atom, the galaxies, etc. The ‘et cetera’ will become clearer later on in this work. In the structured state one finds the quarks, the nuclei, the gasses, liquids and solids, and the galactic liquid. Let us, for example, examine the sequence nucleon-nucleus-atom. As is well known a nucleon is made out of quarks and held together by means of the strong force. The atom is made out of the nucleus and the electron (we will talk about the electron later), and is held together by means of the electromagnetic force. The nucleus, which is in the middle of the sequence, is held together by the strong force (attraction among nucleons) and by the electromagnetic force (repulsion among protons). In other words, we may say that the nucleus is the result of a compromise between these two forces. Let us, now, turn to the sequence atom-(gas, liquid, solid)-galaxy. The gasses, liquids and solids are also formed by two forces, namely, the electromagnetic and the gravitational forces. Because the gravitational force is 10^{39} weaker than the electromagnetic force the polarization in gasses, liquids and solids is achieved by the sole action of the electromagnetic force because it has two signs. But it is well known that large masses of gasses, liquids and solids are unstable configurations of matter in the absence of gravity. Therefore, they are formed by the electromagnetic and gravitational forces. Large amounts of nucleons (and electrons) at some time in the history of the universe gave origin to galaxies which are the biggest individual units of creation. We arrive again at a single fundamental force that holds a galaxy together, which is the gravitational force. There is always the same pattern: one goes from one fundamental force which holds a single unit (nucleon, atom, galaxy) together to two fundamental forces which coexist in a medium. The interactions in the medium form a new unit in which the action of another fundamental force appears. We are not talking any more about the previous unit which exists inside the new unit (such as the nucleons in the nucleus of an atom).

Actually, we can also argue that according to Noether’s theorem¹ there should exist a force connected to baryon number conservation. This is the basis for the proposal on the fifth force. And all experiments do show that the proton does not decay.

By placing all kinds of matter together in a table in the order of the universal expansion we can construct the two tables below, one for the states and units of matter and another one for the fundamental forces.

In order to make an atom we need the electron besides the nucleus. Therefore, just the clumping of nucleons is not enough in this case. Let us just borrow

the electron for now. Therefore, it looks like that the electron belongs to a separate class and is an elementary particle. That is, the electron itself is not one of the units. Therefore, we can complete Table 1 with the prequark and with the Universe. The above considerations may be summarized by the following: *the different kinds of building blocks of the Universe(at different times of the expansion) are intimately related to the idea of filling space.* That is, depending on its size, the Universe is filled with different units.

Following the same reasoning we can say that there should exist a force, other than the strong force, acting between any two prequarks. We call it superstrong force. Also, for the ‘galactic liquid’ there must be another fundamental force at play. Because it must be much weaker than the gravitational force(otherwise, it would already have been found on Earth) we expect it to be a very weak force. Let us call it the superweak force.

Actually, in a nucleus, there is also the action of the superstrong force for very small distances between the nucleons.

Summing up all fundamental forces we arrive at *six forces for nature: the superstrong, the strong, the electromagnetic, the gravitational, the superweak and the weak forces.* We will see later on that these two tables are very important and reveal a very important role of the stable fermions which has not been taken care of until now.

?	quark	nucleon
nucleon	nucleus	atom
atom	gas liquid solid	galaxy
galaxy	galactic medium	?

Table 1.1. The table is arranged in such a way to show the links between the structured states and the units of creation. The interrogation marks above imply the existence of prequarks and of the Universe itself as units of creation

?	?	
	strong force	strong force
strong force	strong force	
	electromagnetic force	electromagnetic force
electromagnetic force	electromagnetic force	
	gravitational force	gravitational force
gravitational force	gravitational force	
	?	?

Table 1.2. Three of the fundamental forces of nature. Each force appears twice and is linked to another force by means of a structured state. The interrogation marks suggest the existence of two other fundamental forces. Compare with Table 1.1.

1.2 Size and Number

We know that the sizes of things are related to relations between the constituent forces. For instance, the size of a mountain is related to the relation between the gravitational and electromagnetic forces because the matter at the base of the mountain can not be smashed by the weight of the matter above the base. Applying the same logic to all forces we have the following. Since primons are very light fermions (baryons) they should have the size of an electron around 10^{-17} m. The 4 primons combine and form the 6 quarks. Thus, the strong and superstrong interactions should have comparable strengths. And that is so, for as we will see the superstrong force strength is about 10 times the strong force strength. We can also see this in the formation of baryons. With the 6 quarks we form about 50 baryons. Going to the next pair of forces we notice that the strong force is about 100 stronger than the electromagnetic force. This is in line with the numbers of nucleons and nuclei, for when we combine the nucleons we form about 10^3 nuclei (or atoms). Following the same reasoning we find that with the electromagnetic and gravitational forces we can form an enormous quantity of things because their relative strengths is about 10^{37} . Also, with the gravitational and superweak forces we make all kinds of structures. This means that the superweak force is much weaker than the gravitational force.

The essence of all this is the following: When the two forces have comparable strengths they compete and limit the number of things done with them.

Conversely, when one is much stronger than the other one the number of things is enormous due to the weak competition between them.

The sizes of things are also related to the strengths between the two forces of each pair. For example, when we put together a small number of atoms they can have arbitrary shapes because the gravitational force is much weaker than the electromagnetic force. When the number of atoms increases the macroscopic body becomes more and more spherical due to the increasing influence of the gravitational force. Let us, then, take a look at the sizes of the units in Table 1.2. They are *primon*, *nucleon*, *atom*, *galaxy*, *Universe*. Their sizes in meters are about $< 10^{-17}$, 10^{-15} , 10^{-10} , 10^{21} , $> 10^{26}$, respectively. Hence, we notice once more that the superweak force should be much weaker than the gravitational force, and that the upper limit for the strength of the superstrong force with respect to the strong force is about 100. From the precision of the equivalence principle we have that the superweak force has to be about 10^{11} weaker than the gravitational force. As we will see in chapter 9 the cross section of the superweak interaction is extremely small.

References

- 1) E. Noether, in *Nach. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen*, 171, 1918.

2 Prequarks, Quarks and Nucleons

2.1 Prequarks and the Number of Quarks

As we saw in chapter 1 it has been proposed by De Souza^(1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12) that Nature has six fundamental forces. One of the new forces, called superstrong force, acts between any two quarks and between quarks constituents. Actually, quark composition is an old idea, although it has been proposed on different grounds^(13,14,15,16). A major distinction is that in this work leptons are supposed to be elementary particles. This is actually consistent with the smallness of the electron mass which is already too small for a particle with a very small radius⁽¹⁷⁾.

In order to distinguish the model proposed in this work from other models of the literature we will name these prequarks with a different name. We may call them primons, a word derived from the Latin word *primus* which means first.

Let us develop some preliminary ideas which will help us towards the understanding of the superstrong interaction. Since a baryon is composed of three quarks it is reasonable to consider that a quark is composed of two primons. The new interaction between them exists by means of the exchange of new bosons.

In order to reproduce the spectrum of 6 quarks and their colors we need 4 primons in 3 supercolor states. Each color is formed by the two supercolors of two different primons that form a particular quark. Therefore, the symmetry group associated with the supercolor field is $SU(2)$. As to the charge, one has charge $(+5/6)e$ and any other one has charge $(-1/6)e$. And what about spin? How can we have prequarks with spins equal to $1/2$ and also have quarks with

spin equal to $1/2$? There are two solutions to this question. One is to consider that at the prequark level Planck's constant is redefined as $\hbar/2$. I adopted this solution in a previous version of this work. It leads to some problems. One of them is that in the end we will have to deal with anyons. But anyons violate P and T while the strong interaction does not. I believe that the other solution is more plausible although it depends on a postulate which may be expressed in the following way: **Primons are fermions with spins equal to $1/2$ but each spin (z component) makes an angle of $\pi/3$ with the direction of the hadron spin (z component), so that the total spin of the quark is $1/2$.** This means that the system of primons in a baryon is a very cooperative system in the sense that primons interact in such a way as to maintain their spins (z component) making either $\pi/3$ or $2\pi/3$ with the baryon's spin direction. The total angle between the two spins of the two primons of a quark should always be $2\pi/3$. Of course, we are saying that primons are special fermions because their spins can not be aligned by a magnetic field due to their mutual interaction that couples each pair making a rigid angle between their spins, and only the total z component of each pair is aligned by the field. This means that primon spin behaves as a normal vector. Thus, with respect to spin such a system is highly ordered. This spin picture sheds some light onto the proton spin puzzle and is in line with the work of Srivastava and Widom on the spin of the proton¹⁸. As we will see shortly in the next sections this is the only spin arrangement that maintains primons as fermions and allows the exchange of scalar and vectorial bosons between primons.

Let us choose the +Z direction as the direction of the proton's spin. Each primon spin contributes with $(1/2) \cos(\pi/3) = (1/4)$ along the Z direction (see Fig 2.1). Thus, each quark has a spin equal to $1/2$. We also see that the spins of the two primons in a quark can rotate freely around the Z axis but they have to rotate at the same time so that the two components in the XY plane cancel out. Therefore, it is possible to have the exchange of scalar and vector bosons between primons of different quarks.

This is quite in line with the known properties of the nuclear potential which may be described with terms due to the exchange of pions as well as the exchange of vector mesons such as ρ and ω . Let us consider that the superstrong field is mediated by the exchange of vector bosons.

As we see above a baryon is a very complex system. That is why the above considerations are quite qualitative and incomplete and deserve further investigation.

Taking into account the above considerations on spin and charge we have the following tables for primons (Tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3). According to Table 2.2 the maximum number of quarks is six. There should exist similar tables for the corresponding antiparticles.

As we will see many different bosons may mediate the strong and superstrong interactions among primons. And there are colored and colorless mesons.

	α	β	γ
α		blue	green
β	blue		red
γ	green	red	

Table 2.1. Generation of colors from supercolors

superflavor	charge	spin
p_1	$+\frac{5}{6}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
p_2	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
p_3	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
p_4	$-\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{1}{2}$

Table 2.2. Electric charges and spins of primons

	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4
p_1		u	c	t
p_2	u		d	s
p_3	c	d		b
p_4	t	s	b	

Table 2.3. Composition of quark flavors

2.2 The Structure of Nucleons, the Sizes of Quarks u and d, and the Stability of the Proton

Deep inelastic electron scattering^(19,20) has shown that the distributions of electric charge in the nucleons are represented by the two graphs below(Figs. 2.2a and 2.2b). These distributions have inspired the pion cloud model of the nucleon which has been quite successful at explaining many of its properties.

Analyzing these two figures one easily sees that shells of electric charge exist in both nucleons. The proton has two shells with mean radii of about 0.2fm and 0.7fm and the neutron has three shells with radii of about 0.15fm, 0.65fm, and 1.8fm. Let us disregard the outermost shell of the neutron. Therefore, each nucleon has two shells of primons located at about 0.16fm and 0.67fm from the center. We can only explain the existence of these shells if we admit that quarks are composite and formed of prequarks. The two shells are, then, prequark shells, showing that a quark is composed of two prequarks. Considering what was presented above primons with the same supercolors tend to stay away from each other and primons with different supercolors attract each other. Therefore,

primons are arranged inside the proton as is shown in Fig. 2.3. The charge of each one of the two shells(inner and outer shells) is $+1/2$. In terms of primon shells we can say that the proton has the configuration

$$(p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta p_3^\gamma)^1 (p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha)^2.$$

The superscripts 1 and 2 mean the inner and outer shells, respectively. Let us dispose the primons of the inner shell clockwise. A primon of one shell with the closest primon of the other shell forms a quark. In each shell there is a plane of primons. The two planes are linked by the three strong bonds, that is, by the three quarks. A primon of a quark with a primon of another quark forms a weak bond when they are different and have different supercolors. The three quarks of the inner shell of the proton, for example, are linked by weak bonds. Due to the exchange of gluons the colors change, and therefore the weak bonds change all the time, but the lowest potential energy of the inner shell should happen when it has three different supercolors since equal colors repel each other. Thus, all possible configurations of the proton are:

$$\begin{aligned} & (p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta p_3^\gamma)^1 (p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha)^2; (p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta p_3^\gamma)^1 (p_2^\gamma p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta)^2; (p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma p_3^\beta)^1 (p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma)^2; \\ & (p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma p_3^\beta)^1 (p_2^\gamma p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha)^2; (p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha p_3^\gamma)^1 (p_2^\gamma p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha)^2; (p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha p_3^\gamma)^1 (p_2^\alpha p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta)^2; \\ & (p_1^\beta p_2^\gamma p_3^\alpha)^1 (p_2^\alpha p_1^\beta p_2^\gamma)^2; (p_1^\beta p_2^\gamma p_3^\alpha)^1 (p_2^\gamma p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta)^2; (p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha p_3^\beta)^1 (p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha)^2; \\ & (p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha p_3^\beta)^1 (p_2^\beta p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha)^2; (p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha)^1 (p_2^\alpha p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta)^2 \text{ and } (p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha)^1 (p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the u quark does not decay p_1 and p_2 have to be stable and since d decays p_3 has to decay as $p_3 \rightarrow p_1 e^- \bar{\nu}_e$. Why then does not the proton decay since it contains a d quark? The outer shell of the proton contains the primons p_1 and p_2 which are stable. Since the proton does not decay the inner shell which is composed of the primons p_1 , p_2 and p_3 has to be very stable. This means that these three primons are in a deep potential well. The neutron, on the other hand, has a p_3 primon in the outer shell, and therefore, may decay. That is, if the p_3 of the outer shell is in a well it must be so shallow that this primon may not be bound(that is, there is no bound state). A quark is not, then, a pointlike particle as a lepton is. It is an extended object. The u and d have average sizes of about 0.5fm and their sizes may be as large as 1fm.

Following the same reasoning the configuration of primons in the neutron should be as shown in Fig. 2.4. The charge of the inner shell is $+1/2$ and the charge of the outer shell is $-1/2$. As we saw above the inner shell of the neutron should be equal to that of the proton. The configuration of the neutron is $(p_1 p_2 p_3)^1 (p_2 p_3 p_2)^2$ which differs from the proton's in the outer shell.

As the neutron decays via the weak interaction into $n \rightarrow p^+ e^- \bar{\nu}_e$ the primon p_3 should decay accordingly as $p_3 \rightarrow p_1 e^- \bar{\nu}_e$. In the case of the neutron the p_3 which decays is that of the outer shell. The primon p_4 should also be unstable against weak decay.

Figures 2.3 and 2.4 are planar displays of three-dimensional spatial configurations. In this way we reconcile the pion cloud vision of the nucleon with the quark model. We easily see that a bare nucleon is a nucleon without its outer shell since it is this shell that makes the difference between nucleons.

We may identify primons as partons¹¹ which are supposed to be pointlike and with spin equal to 1/2. But primons are supposed to be almost massless. Therefore, they do not carry much momenta. Only their pairwise combinations, that is, quarks, carry momenta. That is why it is very difficult to see primons. At very high Q^2 they are not seen simply because they are very light.

Therefore, it looks like that nature has been fooling us since a long time ago, at least since the sixties: **The pointlike particles that we have observed in the nucleon are not quarks, they are prequarks.**

A very important quantity that corroborates the arrangement of primons in the nucleons is the value of the electric dipole moment(EDM) in each nucleon. The values of the EDM for the proton and the neutron are⁽²¹⁾ $d = (-4 \pm 6) \times 10^{-23}$ ecm and $d < 1.1 \times 10^{-25}$ ecm, respectively. According to the above picture we expect that the neutron EDM should be smaller than the proton's because the outer layer of the neutron is ($p_2p_3p_2$) while the proton's is ($p_2p_1p_2$). Therefore, since the primons p_2 and p_3 have the same charge(-1/6), while the primons p_1 and p_2 have quite different charges(+5/6 and -1/6), the outer layer of the neutron should be more spherical than the proton's. And since the inner layer is the same for both nucleons, the neutron EDM should be smaller than the proton's.

This picture also means that each quark(i.e., each pair of primons) does not rotate much about its center of mass.

2.3 The Sizes of Quarks, Primon Mass, and Generation of Quark Mass

Having in mind what was developed above it is reasonable, therefore, to consider that the two primons that form a quark(inside a baryon) are bound by the combination of the strong and superstrong interactions. Therefore, they should generate an effective potential well. Each well has to have just one bound state which is the mass of each quark. Hopefully in the near future we may have more information on such potential.

The heavier a quark is the deeper should be the well generated by the two primons. Also, the well should be narrower because the heavier a quark is the more it must be bound. For a given quantum number, n , the energy of a well increases as it narrows. The potential of the top quark is extremely deep since it is much more massive than the other quarks are. We are able, then, to understand the decays of quarks. The lowest level is, of course, the ground state of the u quark. The ground state of the d quark is slightly above that of the u quark, and the ground state of the s quark is above the ground state of the d quark. This should also happen for the other heavier quarks. Therefore, we expect that the potentials of all quarks should be as shown in Fig.2.5 (the well of the d quark is not shown). These potentials and bound states are in line

with the observed decay chain $b \rightarrow c \rightarrow s \rightarrow u$ and with the decays $d \rightarrow ue\bar{\nu}_e$, $b \rightarrow s\gamma$. What about the masses of primons? Since quarks u and d have about the same mass of 0.3GeV, we expect that p_1, p_2 and p_3 have the same mass. But, since the combination p_1p_3 generates the c quark which is much heavier(about 1.5GeV) than u , we can infer that the different masses of quarks come from the strong and superstrong interactions. Thus, we may suspect that all primons have the same mass which is a sort of primitive, inherent mass, which may be of the same kind of the mass that leptons have.

Let us now see what is behind quark masses. Several researchers have tried to relate their masses to something more fundamental. In order to do this let us approximate each well of Fig. 2.5 by an infinite potential well, that is, the mass of each quark(in units of energy), E_q , should be given by

$$E_q = \frac{\hbar^2\pi^2}{8ma^2} \quad (1)$$

where m is the mass of a primon, and a is the average size of each quark. Since each mass corresponds to a single level in each well, and considering that primons have approximately the same mass, we obtain that each quark mass should be related to the average distance between each pair of primons, that is, to the width of each well. Therefore, we should have the approximate relations:

$$0.3 = \frac{C}{R_u^2}; 0.5 = \frac{C}{R_s^2}; 1.5 = \frac{C}{R_c^2}; 5.0 = \frac{C}{R_b^2}; 150 = \frac{C}{R_t^2}. \quad (2)$$

where C is a constant and R_u, R_s, R_c, R_b and R_t are the widths of the wells. As we discussed in section 2, $R_u \approx 0.5F$. We may assume that $R_u = R_d$. We arrive at the very important relations about quark sizes:

$$R_s^2 = \frac{3}{5}R_u^2 = 0.6R_u^2 \approx 0.15F^2, \quad (3)$$

$$R_c^2 = \frac{5}{15}R_s^2 = \frac{5}{15} \frac{3}{5}R_u^2 = 0.2R_u^2 \approx 0.05F^2, \quad (4)$$

$$R_b^2 = \frac{15}{50}R_c^2 = \frac{15}{50} \frac{5}{15} \frac{3}{5}R_u^2 = 0.06R_u^2 \approx 0.015F^2, \quad (5)$$

$$R_t^2 = \frac{5}{150}R_b^2 = \frac{50}{1500} \frac{15}{50} \frac{5}{15} \frac{3}{5}R_u^2 \approx 0.002R_u^2 \approx 0.0005F^2. \quad (6)$$

It is quite interesting that there are some very fascinating relations. A very important one is:

$$\frac{m_d}{m_u} = \frac{R_u^2}{R_d^2} = 1 = 3^0 \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{m_c}{m_s} = \frac{R_s^2}{R_c^2} = 3 = 3^1 \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{m_t}{m_b} = \frac{R_b^2}{R_t^2} = 30 \approx 3^3, \quad (9)$$

and, thus, there is a factor of 10 between the last two relations. Other quite important relations are:

$$\frac{m_b}{m_s} = \frac{R_s^2}{R_b^2} = 10 \approx 3^2 \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{m_t}{m_c} = \frac{R_c^2}{R_t^2} = 100 \approx 3^4, \quad (11)$$

which has the same factor of 10. Therefore, the heavier a quark is the smaller it is. The approximation $100 \approx 3^4$ is completely justified because we approximated the finite well by an infinite well and also made the top quark mass approximately equal to 150GeV.

The above results agree quite well with the work of Povh and Hüfner²² that have found $\langle r^2 \rangle_{u,d} = 0.36 \text{ fm}^2$ and $\langle r^2 \rangle_s = 0.16 \text{ fm}^2$ as effective radii of the constituent quarks. Also Povh²³ reports the following hadronic radii: $\langle r_h^2 \rangle = 0.72 \text{ fm}^2$, for proton, $\langle r_h^2 \rangle = 0.62 \text{ fm}^2$, for Σ^- , $\langle r_h^2 \rangle = 0.54 \text{ fm}^2$, for Ξ^- , $\langle r_h^2 \rangle = 0.43 \text{ fm}^2$, for π^- , and $\langle r_h^2 \rangle = 0.37 \text{ fm}^2$, for K^- . These radii clearly indicate that the s quark is smaller than the u quark.

In order to have very light primons we can consider that every pair of primons of a quark are bound by means of a very strong spring. Since every potential well has just one level we have the mass of each quark equal to

$$m_q c^2 \approx \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\mu_p}} \quad (12)$$

in which μ_p is the reduced mass of the pair of primons and k is the effective constant of the spring between them. It is worth mentioning that a quite similar idea is used for explaining quark confinement and based on it a term Kr is introduced in the effective potential. For the u quark, for example, we have $m_u c^2 \approx 0.3 \text{ GeV}$. On the other hand if we consider a harmonic potential we have

$$m_q c^2 \approx \frac{1}{2} k_u (R_q)^2 \quad (13)$$

where R_q is the size of the quark q . For u we obtain $k_u \approx 10^{20} \text{ J/m}^2 \approx 2 \text{ GeV/fm}^2$. Using this figure above we obtain $\mu_p \approx 10^{-28} \text{ kg}$ which is about the proton mass. Therefore, in order to have light primons the effective well has to have a larger dependence with the distance between the two primons.

Considering that the potential is symmetrical about the equilibrium position we may try to use the potential

$$V(x) = \alpha_u x^4. \quad (14)$$

The energy levels of the potential $V(x) = \alpha x^v$ are given by²⁴

$$E_n = \left[\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu}} \nu \hbar a^{1/\nu} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{\nu})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{\nu})} \right]^{2\nu/(2+\nu)} \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{2\nu/(2+\nu)}. \quad (15)$$

Thus, for $\nu = 4$ and $n = 0$ we have

$$E_0 = \left[\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2\mu_p}} 4\hbar a_u^{1/4} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{4})}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{4})} \right]^{4/3} \left(0 + \frac{1}{2} \right)^{4/3} \quad (16)$$

and then we obtain (making $E_0 = m_q c^2$)

$$\mu_p \sim 0.25 \hbar^2 \sqrt{\frac{a_u}{(m_q c^2)^3}} \quad (17)$$

which can be extremely light depending on the value of a_u . The above figure should be taken with caution because it is a result of nonrelativistic quantum mechanics but it does not change the fact that primons may have a very small mass.

Thus, if primons interact via a very strong potential such as $V(x) = \alpha_u x^4$ they can be extremely light fermions. We can then propose a more general effective potential of the form $V(x) = \frac{1}{4}\alpha_u x^4 - \frac{1}{2}k_u x^2$ where the last term is chosen negative. Generalizing the coordinate x we can consider the “potential energy ”

$$V_0(\phi) = \frac{1}{4}\lambda^2 \phi^4 - \frac{1}{2}\mu^2 \phi^2 \quad (18)$$

where ϕ is a field related to the presence of the two primons (or of other primons of the same baryon) and is the scalar interaction between them, and μ and λ are real constants. Hence we can propose the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\nu \phi)(\partial^\nu \phi) + \frac{1}{2}\mu^2 \phi^2 - \frac{1}{4}\lambda^2 \phi^4 \quad (19)$$

between the two primons of a quark. Since a quark only exists by means of the combination of the two primons we may consider that its initial mass is very small. The above Lagrangian is symmetric in ϕ but let us recall that primons can interact by other means, electromagnetically, for example. Therefore, we can make the transformation $\phi \rightarrow \phi + \eta_{ev}$ where η_{ev} is a deviation caused by the electromagnetic field and vacuum. The new potential energy up to second power in η_{ev} is

$$V(\phi, \eta_{ev}) = V_0 - \mu^2 \phi \eta_{ev} - \frac{1}{2}\mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 + \lambda^2 \phi^3 \eta_{ev} + \frac{3}{2}\lambda^2 \phi^2 \eta_{ev}^2. \quad (20)$$

$V(\phi, \eta_{ev})$ has a minimum at

$$\eta_{ev}(\phi) = \frac{-\mu^2\phi + \lambda^2\phi^3}{\mu^2 - 3\lambda^2\phi^2}. \quad (21)$$

Since η_{ev} is small let us make $\mu^2\phi - \lambda^2\phi^3 = \delta$ (a small quantity). Then we can make $\phi \approx \pm \frac{\mu}{\lambda} + \epsilon$ and obtain $\epsilon \approx -\frac{\delta}{2\mu^2}$ and thus

$$\phi \approx \pm \frac{\mu}{\lambda} - \frac{\delta}{2\mu^2} \quad (22)$$

and the symmetry has disappeared. But it is not spontaneously broken, it is broken by the perturbation η_{ev} . Substituting the above value of ϕ into Eq 20 we have

$$U(\eta_{ev}) = V(\phi, \eta_{ev}) - V_0 \approx \mu^2\eta_{ev}^2 \quad (23)$$

and the approximate Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\nu\eta_{ev})(\partial^\nu\eta_{ev}) - \mu^2\eta_{ev}^2 \quad (24)$$

which is a Klein-Gordon Lagrangian with mass

$$m = \sqrt{2}\mu\hbar/c \quad (25)$$

which may be an effective mass. This is in complete agreement with the ideas above discussed on primons for as we saw the two primons of a quark have to interact by means of a scalar field because the z components of their spins are neither parallel nor antiparallel. Taking a look at Table 2.3 we observe that we need three scalar bosons, η_{ev}^+ , η_{ev}^- and η_{ev}^0 . The first and second particles are exchanged between the primons of the quarks $p_1p_2(u)$, $p_1p_3(c)$, and $p_1p_4(t)$, and the neutral boson is exchanged between the primons of the quarks $p_2p_3(d)$, $p_2p_4(s)$, and $p_3p_4(b)$. Therefore, three Higgs bosons produce the masses of quarks. This is also in line with the recent observations about the beginning of the Universe which have shown that the Universe expanded from an initial mass²⁵.

It is quite interesting that we should have a triplet of scalar bosons. And we notice immediately a very important trend: The charged bosons produce masses larger than those produced by the neutral boson, considering the quark generations

$$\begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} t \\ b \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, the origin of mass in quarks is also linked to the origin of charge.

This is summarized below in Table 2.4.

Quark	Mass(GeV)	Charge	Mass Generator (Higgs Bosons)
$u(p_1p_2)$	0.3	$+\frac{2}{3}$	η_{ev}^+, η_{ev}^-
$c(p_1p_3)$	1.5	$+\frac{2}{3}$	η_{ev}^+, η_{ev}^-
$t(p_1p_4)$	170	$+\frac{2}{3}$	η_{ev}^+, η_{ev}^-
$d(p_2p_3)$	$\gtrsim 0.3$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	η_{ev}^0
$s(p_2p_4)$	0.5	$-\frac{1}{3}$	η_{ev}^0
$b(p_3p_4)$	4.5	$-\frac{1}{3}$	η_{ev}^0

Table 2.4. The masses of quarks and their generators. As is known the mass of the d quark is slightly larger than that of the u quark. There is a clear division between the three first quarks and the other three quarks. The quarks generated by the charged bosons have larger masses and larger charges and those generated by η_{ev}^0 have smaller masses and smaller charges

Table 2.3 shows that quark masses come from the interaction term, that is, we should have

$$m_{12} = \langle p_1 | \mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 | p_2 \rangle = m_u c^2 = 0.3 GeV \quad (26)$$

$$m_{13} = \langle p_1 | \mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 | p_3 \rangle = m_c c^2 = 1.5 GeV \quad (27)$$

$$m_{14} = \langle p_1 | \mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 | p_4 \rangle = m_t c^2 = 170 GeV \quad (28)$$

$$m_{23} = \langle p_2 | \mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 | p_3 \rangle = m_d c^2 = 0.3 GeV \quad (29)$$

$$m_{24} = \langle p_2 | \mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 | p_4 \rangle = m_s c^2 = 0.5 GeV \quad (30)$$

$$m_{34} = \langle p_3 | \mu^2 \eta_{ev}^2 | p_4 \rangle = m_b c^2 = 4.5 GeV \quad (31)$$

and the following mass matrix:

$$\begin{aligned} M^q &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_{12} & m_{13} & m_{14} \\ m_{12} & 0 & m_{23} & m_{24} \\ m_{13} & m_{23} & 0 & m_{34} \\ m_{14} & m_{24} & m_{34} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_u & m_c & m_t \\ m_u & 0 & m_d & m_s \\ m_c & m_d & 0 & m_b \\ m_t & m_s & m_b & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0.3 & 1.5 & 170 \\ 0.3 & 0 & 0.3 & 0.5 \\ 1.5 & 0.3 & 0 & 4.5 \\ 170 & 0.5 & 4.5 & 0 \end{pmatrix} GeV \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

We cannot diagonalize this matrix because masses come from terms of interaction between different primons, which are off-diagonal terms. This means that the effective potential should contain odd powers of r which make the potential asymmetric. It also means that each mass is an interaction mass and not an intrinsic mass as the mass of an electron. This is quite in line with the idea of a “bare mass” and of a “constituent mass” for quarks although their bare mass have actually to be much smaller.

As we will see in the next section the three bosons η_{ev}^+ , η_{ev}^- and η_{ev}^0 are scalar colored combinations of $p\bar{p}$ pairs. For example, in the u quark the primons p_1 and p_2 exchange the $\eta_{ev}^- = \overline{p_1 p_3} p_3 p_2 + \overline{p_1 p_4} p_4 p_2$ and the $\eta_{ev}^+ = \overline{p_2 p_3} p_3 p_1 + \overline{p_2 p_4} p_4 p_1$ bosons. And in the same way in the c quark the primons p_1 and p_3 exchange the $\eta_{ev}^- = \overline{p_1 p_2} p_2 p_3 + \overline{p_1 p_4} p_4 p_2$ and the $\eta_{ev}^+ = \overline{p_3 p_2} p_2 p_1 + \overline{p_3 p_4} p_4 p_1$ bosons. This means that $\overline{p_1 p_3} p_3 p_2 + \overline{p_1 p_4} p_4 p_2$ and $\overline{p_1 p_2} p_2 p_3 + \overline{p_1 p_4} p_4 p_2$ are expressed mathematically by the same expression.

Some important questions continue lurking about. We may ask for example: Do the masses of primons have an origin at all? It may be an electromagnetic mass, such as the electron's. As we will see later on in section 7.2 gravity is a very strange field and has a huge surprise for us that is revealed thanks to Tables 1 and 2.

2.4 The Seas and Sizes of Nucleons

2.4.1 The Proton Sea Content

In order to find all the interactions let us consider three parts: interactions in the outer shell, interactions in the inner shell and interactions between the two shells, and let us first calculate the transitions in Fig. 2.3. Of course, we are supposing that vacuum (in the presence of matter) creates que $p\bar{p}$ pairs. In order to identify the interactions let us take a look at all the possible vertices. Later on we will identify the bosons that are involved in the interactions.

i) Interactions in the outer shell

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_1^\alpha p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma
\end{aligned}$$

ii) Interactions in the inner shell

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta
\end{aligned}$$

iii) Interactions between the two shells

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma p_2^\gamma p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_2^\gamma p_2^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta.
\end{aligned}$$

The two primons of a quark do not interact by means of vector bosons because their spins (the z components) make an angle (see Fig. 2.1). They can only exchange scalar bosons which are the bosons that produce their masses. And since quarks are colored these bosons are also colored. This does not contradict QCD because QCD gluons are exchanged between quarks. As has been shown experimentally by PETRA gluons are vectorial (spin 1) bosons⁽²⁶⁾. These scalar bosons are:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_1^\beta p_1^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_2^\gamma &+ \overline{p_2^\gamma p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_1^\beta p_1^\beta p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

As we saw in the previous section these bosons are responsible for the production of quark masses.

In the interactions in (iii) the last 6 have to be multiplied by two since they go both ways. We count a total of 82 interactions. Identifying the $q\bar{q}$'s we have:

a) Colored $q\bar{q}$'s in the outer shell:

$d_r\bar{c}_g, s_r\bar{t}_g, d_r\bar{c}_b, s_r\bar{t}_b, u_b\bar{u}_g, d_b\bar{d}_g, s_b\bar{s}_g$, and their antiparticles. In this shell there are no colorless mesons.

b) Colored $q\bar{q}$'s in the inner shell:

$d_b\bar{c}_g, s_b\bar{t}_g, d_b\bar{u}_r, b_b\bar{t}_r, c_g\bar{u}_r, b_g\bar{s}_r$, and their antiparticles. Also, there are no colorless mesons in this shell.

c) Colored $q\bar{q}$'s between the two shells:

$d_r\bar{c}_g, s_r\bar{t}_g, c_b\bar{u}_r, b_b\bar{s}_r, d_b\bar{c}_g, s_b\bar{t}_g, u_r\bar{u}_b, c_r\bar{c}_b, t_r\bar{t}_b, u_b\bar{u}_g, d_b\bar{d}_g, s_b\bar{s}_g, u_r\bar{c}_g, s_r\bar{b}_g$, and their antiparticles. As we will see gluons are colored mesons.

d) Colorless $q\bar{q}$'s:

$2 d\bar{u}, 2 u\bar{d}, 2 b\bar{t}, 2 t\bar{b}, 2 d\bar{c}, 2 c\bar{d}, 2 s\bar{t}, 2 t\bar{s}, 4 u\bar{u}, 4 d\bar{d},$ and $4 s\bar{s}$. This is a very important result because it shows that some mesons are exchanged between quarks in the proton. We will see shortly which mesons are exchanged. Counting the q 's and the \bar{q} 's we obtain: 16 \bar{u} , 16 u , 12 \bar{d} , 12 d , 12 \bar{s} , 12 s , 8 \bar{c} , 8 c , 4 \bar{b} , 4 b , 8 \bar{t} , and 8 t .

If we rotate the supercolors of the inner shell counterclockwise we obtain similar colored mesons between the two shells and the following colorless mesons: 8 $u\bar{u}$, 4 $c\bar{c}$, 4 $t\bar{t}$, 4 $d\bar{d}$, 4 $s\bar{s}$, 2 $c\bar{u}$, 2 $u\bar{c}$, 2 $b\bar{s}$, and 2 $s\bar{b}$. Depending on the spins the combinations of these pairs together with those just seen above can generate the mesons: $\pi^+, \pi^-, \pi^0, \phi(1020), \rho(770), \omega(782), \eta, D^+, D^-, D^0, \bar{D}^0, D^*(2007)^0, D^*(2010)^\pm, \eta_c(1S), J/\Psi(1S), b\bar{t}, t\bar{b}, s\bar{t}, t\bar{s}, B_s^0, \bar{B}_s^0$, and $t\bar{t}$. The exchange of pions inside the proton dictates the proton size of about 1F. As we will see pions are also exchanged inside the neutron. It is important to notice that there are no K^\pm , and no $K^*(892)$. Let us take a closer look at the interactions in the inner shell in the clockwise direction beginning with p_1 . They are:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_1^\gamma &+ \overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\beta p_3^\alpha} \rightarrow p_3^\alpha \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_3^\alpha &+ \overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta} \rightarrow p_2^\beta \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_1^\gamma} \rightarrow p_1^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking a look at the $p\bar{p}$'s pairs, $\overline{p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha}$, $\overline{p_1^\gamma p_4^\beta p_3^\alpha}$, $\overline{p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma p_2^\beta}$, $\overline{p_3^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_2^\beta}$, $\overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_1^\gamma}$, and $\overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_1^\gamma}$ we notice that the numbers of p_i^j 's and \bar{p}_i^j 's are the same. They are supergluons created by vacuum and arranged in a certain way to make the interactions possible. As we will see later on this inner shell is quite stable.

2.4.2 The Neutron Sea Content

Doing the same for the neutron (Fig 2.4) we obtain the same number of transitions. After averaging over the two configurations we obtain similar colored $q\bar{q}$'s and the following colorless $q\bar{q}$'s: 8 $u\bar{u}$, 12 $d\bar{d}$, 8 $s\bar{s}$, 2 $c\bar{u}$, 2 $b\bar{s}$, 2 $u\bar{d}$, 2 $d\bar{c}$, 2 $t\bar{s}$, 2 $t\bar{b}$, 4 $b\bar{b}$, 4 $c\bar{c}$, and their antiparticles. Their combinations generate the mesons: π^+ , π^- , π^0 , $\phi(1020)$, $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, η , D^+ , D^- , D^0 , \bar{D}^0 , $D^*(2007)^0$, $D^*(2010)^\pm$, $\eta_c(1S)$, $J/\Psi(1S)$, $b\bar{t}$, $t\bar{b}$, B_s^0 , \bar{B}_s^0 , $\Upsilon(1S)$, $t\bar{b}$, and $b\bar{t}$. Again, the exchange of pions determines neutron's size of about 1F. Counting the q 's and the \bar{q} 's we have: 12 \bar{u} , 12 u , 16 \bar{d} , 16 d , 12 \bar{s} , 12 s , 8 \bar{c} , 8 c , 8 \bar{b} , 8 b , 4 \bar{t} , and 4 t .

2.4.3 The Contribution of Both Seas to the Structure Function $F_2(x)$

According to the parton picture we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{x}F_2^{ep}(x) &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [u^p(x) + \bar{u}^p(x)] + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [c^p(x) + \bar{c}^p(x)] + \\
&\quad \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [t^p(x) + \bar{t}^p(x)] + \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [d^p(x) + \bar{d}^p(x)] + \\
&\quad \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [s^p(x) + \bar{s}^p(x)] + \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [b^p(x) + \bar{b}^p(x)] \quad (33)
\end{aligned}$$

for the proton, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{x}F_2^{en}(x) &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [u^n(x) + \bar{u}^n(x)] + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [c^n(x) + \bar{c}^n(x)] + \\
&\quad \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [t^n(x) + \bar{t}^n(x)] + \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [d^n(x) + \bar{d}^n(x)] + \\
&\quad \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [s^n(x) + \bar{s}^n(x)] + \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [b^n(x) + \bar{b}^n(x)] \quad (34)
\end{aligned}$$

for the neutron. In these equations $q(x)$ represents the probability distribution of quark q . In general it has been considered in the literature that $u^p(x) = d^n(x)$, $d^p(x) = u^n(x)$, $s^p(x) = s^n(x)$, $c^p(x) = c^n(x)$, $b^p(x) = b^n(x)$, and $t^p(x) = t^n(x)$, but as we saw above these equalities are not true. According to what was calculated above, in both nucleon seas (the colorless seas) $u = \bar{u}$, $d = \bar{d}$, $s = \bar{s}$, $c = \bar{c}$, $b = \bar{b}$, and $t = \bar{t}$. Substituting these results and the numbers obtained above we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{x}F_2^{ep}(x) &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [2 \times 16 + 2 \times 8 + 2 \times 4] + \\
&\quad \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [2 \times 12 + 2 \times 12 + 2 \times 4] = 31.1111 \quad (35)
\end{aligned}$$

for the proton, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{x}F_2^{en}(x) &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 [2 \times 12 + 2 \times 8 + 2 \times 4] + \\
&\quad \left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^2 [2 \times 16 + 2 \times 12 + 2 \times 8] = 29.333333 \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

for the neutron. These numbers represent the contributions of each sea to the two structure functions. We obtain then the very important result

$$\frac{F_2^{en}}{F_2^{ep}} = \frac{29.3333}{31.11111} = 0.94286. \quad (37)$$

The saturation, therefore, due to the sea of $q\bar{q}$'s never reaches one. This agrees completely with SLAC result shown in Figs. 2.6 for low x . For high x the sea does not contribute and we expect to have this ratio equal to 0.25 which is a well known result.

References

1. M. E. de Souza, in *Proceedings of the XII Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields*, Caxambu, Minas Gerais, Brazil, September 18-22, 1991.
2. M.E. de Souza, IX Meeting of Physicists of the North and Northeast, Maceió, Alagoas, Brazil, November 07 and 08, 1991.
3. M.E. de Souza, 13th Interantional Conference on General Relativity and Gravitation, Huerta Grande, Cordoba, Argentina, June 28-July 4, 1992.
4. M.E. de Souza, in *Proceedings of the XIII Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields*, Caxambu, Minas Gerais, Brazil, September 16-20, 1992.
5. M.E. de Souza, X Meeting of Physicists of the North/Northeast, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil, December 2-4, 1992.
6. M.E. de Souza, in *Proceedings of the XIV Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields*, Caxambu, Minas Gerais, Brazil, September 29-October 3, 1993.
7. M.E. de Souza, XI Meeting of Physicists of the North/Northeast, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil, November 17-19, 1993.
8. M.E. de Souza, in *The Six Fundamental Forces of Nature*, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, São Cristóvão, Sergipe, Brazil, February 1994.
9. M.E. de Souza, International Symposium Physics Doesn't Stop: Recent Developments in Phenomenology, University of Wisconsin, Madison(Wisconsin), USA, April 11-13, 1994.
10. M.E. de Souza, in *Proceedings of the XV Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields*, Angra dos Reis, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, October 4-8, 1994.
11. M.E. de Souza, XVI Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields, Caxambu, MinasGerais, Brazil, October 24-28, 1995.
12. M.E. de Souza, XVII Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields, Serra Negra, Minas Gerais, Brazil, October 24-28, 1996.
13. E.J. Eichten, K.D. Lane, and M.E. Peskin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 50, 811 (1983).
14. K. Hagiwara, S. Komamiya, and D. Zeppenfeld, *Z. Phys.* C29, 115 (1985).
15. N. Cabibbo, L. Maiani, and Y. Srivastava, *Phys. Lett.* 139, 459 (1984).
16. H. Fritzsch, in *Proceedings of the twenty-second Course of the International School of Subnuclear Physics*, 1984, ed. by A. Zichichi (Plenum Press, New York, 1988).
17. G. 'tHooft, in *Recent Developments in Gauge Theories*, eds. G. 'tHooft et al., Plenum Press, New York, 1980.
18. Y.N.Srivastava and A.Widom, hep-ph/0009032.
19. E.E. Chambers and R. Hofstadter, *Phys. Rev.* 103, 1454 (1956).
20. C. Kittel, W. D. Knight and M. A. Ruderman, in *Mechanics*, Berkeley Physics Course, Vol. 1, pg. 451, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York(1965).
21. Particle Data Group, Review of Particle Properties, *Phys. Rev. D*, 54, Part II, No. 1 (1966).
22. B. Povh and J. Hüfner, *Phys. Lett. B*, 245, 653 (1990).

23. B.Povh, hep-ph/9908233.
24. D. terHaar, in *Problems in Quantum Mechanics*, Pion Limited, London, 1975.
25. C. Seife, *Science*, Vol. 292, No. 5518, p. 823 (2001).
26. D. H. Perkins, in *Introduction to High Energy Physics*, Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, CA, USA, 1987, p. 301.

3 The Strong, Superstrong and Higgs Bosons, Gluons and Interactions Between Primons

3.1 The Higgs Bosons

As we saw in the previous chapter the scalar colored bosons that are exchanged in the $u(p_1p_2)$ quark are $\eta_{ev}^- = \overline{p_1p_2}p_2p_3 + \overline{p_1p_4}p_4p_2$ and $\eta_{ev}^+ = \overline{p_2p_3}p_3p_1 + \overline{p_2p_4}p_4p_1$. In the same way in the $d(p_2p_3)$ quark the boson $\eta_{ev}^0 = \overline{p_2p_1}p_1p_3 + \overline{p_2p_4}p_4p_3 = \overline{p_3p_1}p_1p_2 + \overline{p_3p_4}p_4p_2$ is exchanged. Doing the same for the other quarks we obtain Table 3.1 below. As we saw before we can identify η_{ev}^+ , η_{ev}^- , and η_{ev}^0 as the Higgs bosons. That is, the Higgs bosons are scalar colored bosons and are combinations of $p\bar{p}$ pairs.

Although η_{ev}^+ has three expressions in terms of $p\bar{p}$ pairs its mathematical expression has to be unique and is not expressed yet in this and should be found.

When writing the Klein-Gordon equation

$$\left[\partial^\mu \partial_\mu + \left(\frac{mc}{\hbar} \right)^2 \right] \phi = 0 \quad (38)$$

for the uncharged Higgs field we should be careful because, actually, m is not an intrinsic(or bare) mass but an interaction mass because the Higgs are collections of $\overline{p_jp_k}p_kp_i$ and are colored mesons. Of course, we should go on and find out what m really is.

Higgs Bosons	Expression in Terms of $p\bar{p}$ pairs
η_{ev}^+	$\frac{\overline{p_2 p_3 p_3 p_1} + \overline{p_2 p_4 p_4 p_1}}{\overline{p_3 p_2 p_2 p_1} + \overline{p_3 p_4 p_4 p_1}}$ $\frac{\overline{p_4 p_3 p_3 p_1} + \overline{p_4 p_2 p_2 p_1}}{\overline{p_4 p_3 p_3 p_1} + \overline{p_4 p_2 p_2 p_1}}$
η_{ev}^0	$\frac{\overline{p_2 p_1 p_1 p_3} + \overline{p_2 p_4 p_4 p_3}}{\overline{p_3 p_1 p_1 p_2} + \overline{p_3 p_4 p_4 p_2}}$ $\frac{\overline{p_2 p_1 p_1 p_4} + \overline{p_2 p_1 p_1 p_4}}{\overline{p_4 p_1 p_1 p_2} + \overline{p_4 p_1 p_1 p_2}}$ $\frac{\overline{p_3 p_1 p_1 p_4} + \overline{p_3 p_2 p_2 p_4}}{\overline{p_4 p_1 p_1 p_3} + \overline{p_4 p_2 p_2 p_3}}$
η_{ev}^-	$\frac{\overline{p_1 p_3 p_3 p_2} + \overline{p_1 p_4 p_4 p_2}}{\overline{p_1 p_2 p_2 p_3} + \overline{p_1 p_4 p_4 p_3}}$ $\frac{\overline{p_1 p_3 p_3 p_4} + \overline{p_1 p_2 p_2 p_4}}{\overline{p_1 p_3 p_3 p_4} + \overline{p_1 p_2 p_2 p_4}}$

Table 3.1. Expressions of the Higgs bosons in terms of primons.

Therefore, primons are very important fermions. Not only they form quarks, they also form supergluons, gluons and Higgs bosons. And we are seeing that the realm of mass is very strange for *mass comes from within*.

3.2 The Bosons of the Strong and Superstrong Interactions

Doing the same for the other pairs of primons as we did in the case of nucleons we find (for $i \neq j$) the other colorless $q\bar{q}$'s:

$$p_1^i + \overline{p_1^i p_3^j p_3^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i$$

$$p_1^i + \overline{p_1^i p_2^j p_2^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i$$

$$p_2^i + \overline{p_2^i p_3^j p_3^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i$$

$$\begin{aligned}
p_2^i &+ \overline{p_2^i p_1^j p_1^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i \\
p_3^i &+ \overline{p_3^i p_2^j p_2^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i \\
p_3^i &+ \overline{p_3^i p_1^j p_1^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i \\
p_4^i &+ \overline{p_4^i p_1^j p_1^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i \\
p_4^i &+ \overline{p_4^i p_2^j p_2^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i \\
p_4^i &+ \overline{p_4^i p_3^j p_3^j p_4^i} \rightarrow p_4^i
\end{aligned}$$

and also in the opposite way. That is, we find the $q\bar{q}$'s: $b\bar{c}$, $c\bar{b}$, $s\bar{u}$, $u\bar{s}$, $b\bar{d}$, $d\bar{b}$, $t\bar{u}$, $u\bar{t}$, $s\bar{d}$, $d\bar{s}$, $t\bar{c}$, $c\bar{t}$, $t\bar{t}$, $s\bar{s}$, and $b\bar{b}$. Taking into account spin these pairs generate the mesons: K^\pm , K^0 , \bar{K}^0 , $K^*(892)$, $\phi(1020)$, $b\bar{c}$, $c\bar{b}$, B^0 , \bar{B}^0 , $t\bar{u}$, $u\bar{t}$, $t\bar{c}$, $c\bar{t}$, $t\bar{t}$, and $b\bar{b}$.

Besides these we still have the mesons $p_1 p_2 \overline{p_3 p_4}$, $p_1 p_3 \overline{p_2 p_4}$, $p_1 p_4 \overline{p_2 p_3}$, $p_2 p_3 \overline{p_1 p_2}$, $p_2 p_4 \overline{p_1 p_2}$, $p_3 p_4 \overline{p_1 p_2}$ and their antiparticles. The first one, for example, appears in the interaction $p_3 p_4 + \overline{p_3 p_4} p_1 p_2 \rightarrow p_1 p_2$. The first two are the mesons D_s^\pm , B^\pm . These and the other ones calculated above are quite familiar to us. We just have to classify them in terms of the two interactions. In the interaction between two nucleons the dominant term is due to the exchange of pions (we will discuss this subject later on), and as we know pions are pseudoscalar mesons. Thus, we may assume that scalar mesons mediate the strong interaction. On the other hand we may consider that the vectorial mesons mediate the superstrong interaction. That is, the superstrong interaction is caused by a vectorial field. We can, then, separate the bosons according to these two interactions. We find, of course, that spin plays a major role in the two interactions. According to the type of interaction we have:

- a) Colorless Bosons of the strong interaction: π^+ , π^- , π^0 , η , K^+ , K^- , K^0 , \bar{K}^0 , D^+ , D^- , D^0 , \bar{D}^0 , D_s^+ , D_s^- , B^+ , B^- , B^0 , \bar{B}^0 , B_s^0 , \bar{B}_s^0 , $\eta_c(1S)$, etc.
- b) Colorless Bosons of the superstrong interaction: $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$, $K^*(892)$, $D^*(2007)^0$, $D^*(2010)^\pm$, $J/\psi(1S)$, $\psi(2S)$, $\psi(3700)$, $\psi(4040)$, $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, $\Upsilon(3S)$, $\Upsilon(4S)$, etc.

Gluons are mediators of one of the properties of quarks which is color. As we will see they are bosons of an effective field. Supergluons (mediators of the supercolor field) are more fundamental.

Taking a look at the five fundamental interactions(weak, electromagnetic, strong, superstrong and gravitational) we notice that only the gravitational and electromagnetic interactions have just one boson, each, because they are massless bosons. We also observe that only the weak interaction has three vector bosons, which is a small and limited number of bosons. The strong and superstrong interactions have many bosons and some of them have masses of the same order. As was discussed in the first chapter there should still exist another interaction called superweak interaction which was proposed by de Souza in 1991^{1,2}. Actually it is a modified version of the fifth force, proposed in 1987 by Fischbach³. Since its range is supposed to be infinite its boson should be

massless. Therefore, the overall picture for the fundamental interactions is the following: nature has six fundamental interactions, three with infinite ranges and three with very small ranges, that is, there are three interactions with massive bosons and three interactions with massless bosons. The weak force is different from the other two small range forces because it has only three very heavy bosons. As we will see its bosons are the heaviest of all. Arranging the fundamental forces in a table we obtain Table 3.2 below.

Interaction	Bosons	Nature of the Field
Superstrong	supergluons,	
	$\rho(770), \omega(782), \phi(1020), K^*(892)$	
	$D^*(2007)^0, D^*(2010)^\pm, J/\psi(1S),$	
	$\psi(2S), \psi(3700), \psi(4040), \Upsilon(1S),$	
	$\Upsilon(2S), \Upsilon(3S), \Upsilon(4S), \dots$	Vector
Strong	$\pi^\pm, \pi^0, \eta, K^\pm, K^0, K^{\bar{0}}, D^\pm, D^0,$	
	$D^0, D_s^+, D_s^-, B^+, B^-, B^0,$	
	$\bar{B}^0, B_s^0, \bar{B}_s^0, \eta_c(1S), \dots$	Pseudoscalar
Electromagnetic	γ	Vector
Weak	Z^0, W^\pm	Vector
Gravitational	$g?$	Tensor?
Superweak	\mathcal{N}	Scalar?

Table 3.2. The Fundamental Forces of Nature and their Bosons. Observe that three interactions have massless bosons and the other three have massive bosons.

3.3 The Nature of Gluons

Let us analyze what the interaction $u_b + \bar{b}g \rightarrow u_g$ means in terms of primons. We will be able, then, to find out the nature of gluons and to show that they are colored mesons and are massless because are colored. Having in mind that supercolors can be interchanged the above interaction is actually any of the four interactions:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a) & p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta + \bar{b}g \rightarrow p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma \\
 b) & p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta + \bar{b}g \rightarrow p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha \\
 c) & p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha + \bar{b}g \rightarrow p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma \\
 d) & p_1^\beta p_2^\alpha + \bar{b}g \rightarrow p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha.
 \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the one-gluon interactions that are involved. The first interaction is the result of any of the interactions

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma p_2^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_3^\beta p_3^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\beta p_4^\beta p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha \\
p_1^\alpha &+ \overline{p_1^\alpha p_4^\gamma p_4^\gamma p_1^\alpha} \rightarrow p_1^\alpha
\end{aligned}$$

together with any of the following interactions

$$\begin{aligned}
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_1^\alpha p_1^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma \\
p_2^\beta &+ \overline{p_2^\beta p_4^\alpha p_4^\alpha p_2^\gamma} \rightarrow p_2^\gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

The colored mesons with one-gluon exchange are in the last three interactions. They are $u^g \overline{u^b}$, $d^g \overline{d^b}$, and $s^g \overline{s^b}$. Similarly, the one-gluon interactions involved in (b), $p_1^\alpha p_2^\beta + \overline{b}g \rightarrow p_1^\gamma p_2^\alpha$ are $p_1^\alpha \rightarrow p_2^\alpha$, $p_2^\beta \rightarrow p_1^\gamma$ which involve the exchange of the colorless mesons $d\overline{c}$ and $s\overline{t}$, and the colored mesons $c^g \overline{d^b}$ and $t^g \overline{s^b}$.

We also find that interaction (c) above involves the exchange of the colored mesons $d^g \overline{c^b}$ and $s^g \overline{t^b}$. Finally, in interaction (d) above there is the exchange of the colored mesons $u^g \overline{u^b}$, $c^g \overline{c^b}$, and $t^g \overline{t^b}$. Summarizing we have that the gluon $\overline{b}g$ that acts between two u quarks is the overall effect of the action of the colored mesons: $u^g \overline{u^b}$, $d^g \overline{d^b}$, $s^g \overline{s^b}$, $c^g \overline{d^b}$, $t^g \overline{s^b}$, $d^g \overline{c^b}$, $s^g \overline{t^b}$, $u^g \overline{u^b}$, $c^g \overline{c^b}$, and $t^g \overline{t^b}$. We see that it is a set of nine colored mesons.

Let us now see which mesons we have in the interaction $d_b + \overline{b}g \rightarrow d_g$. Doing in the same way as we did above we find that they are the colored mesons: $c^g \overline{c^b}$, $d^g \overline{d^b}$, $b^g \overline{b^b}$, $c^g \overline{u^b}$, $u^g \overline{c^b}$, $b^g \overline{s^b}$, $s^g \overline{b^b}$, $u^g \overline{u^b}$, $s^g \overline{s^b}$. It also has nine members. We clearly see that this set is different from that one just above and since QCD tells us that they are equivalent, i.e., they are the same gluon, then each colored meson has to be massless and equivalent to any other one. And they have to be massless because they are colored mesons. In the calculation of the amplitude M of the interaction $q_b + \overline{b}g \rightarrow q_g$, the effective coupling constant $g_s = \sqrt{4\pi\alpha_s}$ is equal to nine times the coupling constant of each colored mesons, G_c . That is, $g_s = 9G_c$. As we see, together with each one-gluon exchange there is also the exchange of colorless mesons (scalar or vectorial mesons). We just stop at this point because the calculations for all gluons are enormous, of course. This means that gluons (that is, QCD) simplifies matters a lot. That is actually the reason why QCD is so great and successful. We conclude then that the color field is the field of a collective effective interaction such as other collective interactions like magnons or phonons.

3.4 The Interaction Matrix Between Primons of Different Quarks with Different Supercolors

As we saw in the sections above we need four primons and three supercolors to generate quarks in the three colors. This means that in terms of flavors primons can be represented by the Dirac spinors

$$\Psi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Psi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Psi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Psi_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

As to supercolors we may represent them by the three-element columns

$$sc_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad sc_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad sc_\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The supercolor generators are the three-dimensional generators of $SU(2)$

$$\Theta^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \\ 0 & i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Theta^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & i \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Theta^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 \\ i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

which are three of the eight generators of $SU(3)$, and obey the relations

$$[\Theta^j, \Theta^k] = i\varepsilon^{jkl}\Theta^l. \quad (39)$$

Let us call them supergluons. Such as gluons supergluons are vectorial ($S = 1$) and also massless. According to the ideas above developed the combinations of equal supercolors do not produce a color. That is exactly what we have:

$$sc_\alpha^\dagger \Theta^j sc_\alpha = sc_\beta^\dagger \Theta^j sc_\beta = sc_\gamma^\dagger \Theta^j sc_\gamma = 0,$$

where $j = 1, 2, 3$. With different supercolors we have the sums:

$$\sum_{j=1}^3 sc_\alpha^\dagger \Theta^j sc_\beta = -i, \quad \sum_{j=1}^3 sc_\alpha^\dagger \Theta^j sc_\gamma = i, \quad \sum_{j=1}^3 sc_\beta^\dagger \Theta^j sc_\gamma = -i.$$

Therefore, the substructure of $SU(3)$ (color) is $SU(2)$ (supercolor).

Between two primons of different quarks there is the exchange of colored mesons which are part of the gluonic coupling between them. For example, in the interaction between the two primons p_1^α , and p_2^β we should have diagram 1 (listed as Fig 3.1). The mesons $d_r \bar{c}_g$ and $s_r \bar{t}_g$ are exchanged in this case. The

gluonic coupling g_{pp} , between two primons is, then, just 2/9 of the gluonic coupling between two quarks. Hence, the interaction matrix for the above primons (with the above supercolors) is

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= i \sum_{jk} \left[\overline{\Psi_1(3)sc_3^\dagger} \right] \left[-i \frac{g_{pp}}{2} \Theta^j \gamma^\mu \right] [\Psi_1(1)sc_1] \left[\frac{-i g_{\mu\nu} \delta^{jk}}{q^2} \right] \left[\overline{\Psi_2(4)sc_4^\dagger} \right] \\
&\quad \times \left[-i \frac{g_{pp}}{2} \Theta^k \gamma^\nu \right] \times [\Psi_2(2)sc_2]
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

and hence we obtain

$$M = \sum_j \frac{-g_{pp}^2}{4} \frac{1}{q^2} \left[\overline{\Psi_1(3)\gamma^\mu\Psi_1(1)} \right] \left[\overline{\Psi_2(4)\gamma_\mu\Psi_2(2)} \right] \left(sc_3^\dagger \Theta^j sc_1 \right) \left(sc_4^\dagger \Theta^j sc_2 \right). \tag{41}$$

Therefore, the potential between the two primons is a Coulombian-like potential

$$V_{pp} = -F \frac{g_{pp} \hbar c}{4\pi} \frac{1}{r} \tag{42}$$

where F is a supercolor factor given by

$$F = \frac{1}{4} \sum_j \left(sc_3^\dagger \Theta^j sc_1 \right) \left(sc_4^\dagger \Theta^j sc_2 \right) \tag{43}$$

in which sc stands for the supercolor wavefunction. Let us calculate the supercolor factor F in the interaction between the two primons above. In this case F is given by

$$F = \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[2 \sum_j \left(\Theta_{11}^j \Theta_{22}^j + \Theta_{12}^j \Theta_{21}^j \right) \right] = \frac{1}{4} (1) = \frac{1}{4}. \tag{44}$$

where Θ_{jk}^i are the matrix elements of the generators. Since $F > 0$, there is a net attraction between the two primons due to the supercolor field. This means that the inner shell of the nucleons is very tightly bound because it has three different supercolors. That is the reason why it has a mean radius of only ≈ 0.15 fm.

We should still consider the repulsion and attraction due to the exchange of colorless mesons between primons with equal supercolors.

3.5 The Lagrangian of Quantum Superchromodynamics

What we developed above in section 3.4, following the footsteps of QCD, is a quantum superchromodynamics(QSCD) which deals with the interactions between primons with different supercolors. According to what was established until now primons should be very light fermions with a mass of about 1eV. Then, we can propose that the free Lagrangian for primons is

$$L = i\hbar c \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi - mc^2 \bar{\Psi} \Psi \quad (45)$$

in which Ψ is the column

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_\alpha \\ \Psi_\beta \\ \Psi_\gamma \end{pmatrix} \quad (46)$$

and Ψ_i is a four-component Dirac spinor. In the same way as is done in QCD we can construct the gauge invariant (under supercolor SU(2)) QSCD Lagrangian

$$L = i\hbar c \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi - mc^2 \bar{\Psi} \Psi - \frac{1}{16\pi} \Gamma^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu} - g_{sc} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \Theta \Psi A_\mu \quad (47)$$

in which g_{sc} is the supercolor coupling constant, and $\Gamma^{\mu\nu}$ are the supergluon fields. The above Lagrangian should hold for each primon because there are four different mass terms. That is, there are four different Lagrangians.

Since primons are almost massless the Lagrangian (for each primon) can be written as

$$L = i\hbar c \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu \Psi - \frac{1}{16\pi} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} - g_{sc} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\mu \Theta \Psi A_\mu. \quad (48)$$

The above Lagrangians given by Eqs. 47 and 48 are invariant under local SU(2) gauge transformations and describe the interaction of each primon (that is, each flavor) with the three massless vector fields (supergluons). The Dirac fields make the three supercolor currents

$$I^\zeta = cg_{sc} \bar{\Psi} \gamma^\zeta \Theta \Psi \quad (49)$$

which are the sources of the supercolor fields.

3.6 Primons and Weak Interactions

As we saw p_1 and p_2 are stable, and p_3 and p_4 are unstable. Since d decays into u according to $d \rightarrow ue^- \bar{\nu}_e$, p_3 has to decay as $p_3 \rightarrow p_1 e^- \bar{\nu}_e$. Other weak decays of quarks cannot be explained in such a simple way in terms of primons. It is a very hard task to build a whole new theory of weak interactions of quarks

taking into account the existence of primons. It is a hard task but there are some clues to follow. As we saw above primons have to exist: **there are many compelling evidences.**

References

1. M.E. de Souza, in *Proceedings of the XII Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields*, Caxambu, Minas Gerais, Brazil, September 18-22, 1991.
2. M.E. de Souza, in *The Six Fundamental Forces of Nature*, p. 6, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, 1994.
3. E. Fischbach, in *Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Gravitational Measurements, Fundamental Metrology and Constants*, 1987, ed. by V. de Sabbata and V. N. Melnikov (D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, 1988).

4 Some Topics of QCD

4.1 The Potential of a Quark Pair and the Usual QCD Potential

As two quarks($Q\bar{Q}$) are brought to a very close distance(below 0.5 fm, presumably) from each other they should experience the strong force and also the superstrong force. Since $Q\bar{Q}$ form bound states there should exist a net molecular potential well between them. At large distances it should be dominated by the strong force (Yukawa) potential

$$V_{Q\bar{Q}}(r) = -\frac{(g_s^Q)^2 e^{-\mu_s r}}{r}. \quad (50)$$

On the other hand QCD shows that there is an effective Coulombian potential produced by the color field given by

$$V_{QCD}(r) = -\frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s}{r} + \beta r. \quad (51)$$

We do not know the value of g_s^Q , but we may assume that $(g_s^Q)^2$ is of the order of α_s . Then, it is easy to see that for $\mu r \ll 1$ the two potentials may have the same order of magnitude. When r increases $V_{Q\bar{Q}}$ will be above the first term of V_{QCD} , which decreases slowly to zero. The term βr raises the potential and makes it get closer to $V_{Q\bar{Q}}$, as is shown in Fig. 4.1.

It has been said in most textbooks on elementary particles that the data of the experiments UA1 (Arnison et al.)⁽¹⁾ and UA2 (Bagnaia et al.)⁽²⁾ at the CERN $p(\bar{p})$ collider provide the best direct evidence that the QCD potential

at small r is proportional to $1/r$. But, the data show much more than this simplistic conclusion. The data is shown in Fig. 4.2. Parametrizing the data in the form $(\sin\frac{\theta}{2})^{-n}$ one obtains $n = 4.16$ for the slope up to $\sin^4\theta/2 \approx 0.1$. Notice that the center of the first point at the top is off the straight line somewhat. This deviation may indicate that the differential cross section tends to saturate as we go to small angles. A better fitting to the data may be provided by a differential cross section of the form

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \propto \frac{1}{(1 + 4(\frac{k}{\mu_{ss}})^2 \sin^2\frac{\theta}{2})^2} \quad (52)$$

which means that the interacting potential for very short distances is of the Yukawa type. Since $q^2 = 2000\text{GeV}^2$, q is about 45 GeV, and so, $k = 1.56 \times 10^3\text{fm}^{-1}$. For $\sin^4\theta/2 \approx 0.01$, $\theta \approx 37^\circ$. This is not a small angle, and if the saturation is already beginning for such angles, then

$$4\left(\frac{k}{\mu_{ss}}\right)^2 \sin^2\theta/2 \sim 1. \quad (53)$$

This means that $\mu_{ss} \sim 10 - 10^3\text{fm}^{-1}$, and thus the order of magnitude of the range of the superstrong interaction is of about $0.1 - 10^{-3}\text{fm}$. Therefore, its bosons have masses in the range (1 - 1000) GeV. Several experiments have, indeed, shown that the strong force becomes repulsive at distances smaller than about 0.45 fm. Of course, it is not the strong force, it is the superstrong force.

The success of the usual QCD potential is due to the use of several adjustable parameters in the models and due to the existence of the two primon shells described in chapter 2. As we saw the inner shell is quite close to the center (mean radius of only $r_1 = 0.15\text{fm}$) while the outer shell has quite a large mean radius r_2 of about 0.65fm, that is, $r_2 \approx 4r_1$. Therefore, it is almost a central potential for the primons of the outer shell. That is, we can say that there is an approximate central potential due to the existence of a strong charge g_1 at the center and another strong charge in the outer layer. Let us now estimate the value of the coupling constant $\alpha_s \approx g_1 g_2$ between the two shells. Each quark has a strong charge of about 1/3. Thus, a primon has a strong charge of about 1/6. But each shell has three primons, and therefore, each shell has a strong charge of about $3 \times \frac{1}{6} = \frac{1}{2}$. Then, the product $g_1 g_2$, that is, α_s , is about 0.25 which is the experimental value of α_s at $Q = 3\text{GeV}$. As discussed above, at very high Q the effective coupling should diminish due to the action of the superstrong interaction. The lowest value of α_s (around 0.1) at $Q = 100\text{GeV}$ does include the effect of the superstrong force. Please, find below a very important discussion on α_s . It is worth saying that the potential

$$V_{QCD}(r) = -\frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s}{r} + \beta r. \quad (54)$$

has a very serious inconsistency when applied to mesons: it allows an infinite number of bound states and this is not realistic at all.

Therefore, the effective potential between quarks should be a molecular potential (due to the exchange of scalar and vectorial mesons) which can be approximately described by a Coulombian potential (due to the effective color field). As will be shown below the molecular potential also exhibits asymptotic freedom.

As was seen in chapter 3 gluons are sets of colored mesons, that is, gluons are effective collective bosons. In other words, they produce an overall action which is the result of the actions of the exchanges of all the different colored mesons, and they are, then, bosons of an effective field which is produced by the collective interactions of supercolors and colors. As we saw in chapter 3 the more basic interactions are governed by SU(2). When we consider the interactions between quarks the overall effective interaction mediated by gluons is described by SU(3). This means that QCD is a great theory exactly because it simplifies matters a lot since gluons are collections of colored mesons.

4.2 The Confining Term of the Usual QCD Potential

Quarks are confined to distances shorter than 1F in nucleons, for example. Let us try to understand why this is so. According to what was developed above pions and other mesons are exchanged between quarks inside nucleons. The mesons with the longest ranges are pions. That is why nucleons have sizes of approximately 1F, and that is why quarks are confined to 1F.

In the light of what was developed up to now we see that when we try to free the quarks of a proton with another proton we force the distance between their quarks to be very small, that is, we make the quarks of the two protons to get very close and, consequently, heavier scalar and vector mesons (colorless) are exchanged among their primons, that is, among their quarks, and therefore, they get more and more bound.

For improving our understanding on this issue let us assume that the overall interaction with one scalar meson and a more massive vector meson produces a sort of molecular-like potential, which to a good approximation can be described by (not very far from equilibrium)

$$V(r) = V_o + \frac{1}{2}kr^2 - \gamma r^3. \quad (55)$$

Depending on the values of the constants the last two terms of the right side may be very close to $-\frac{4}{3}\frac{\alpha}{r} + \beta r$ (take a look at Fig. 4.1).

4.3 Asymptotic Freedom

It has been proven in the literature that the coupling constant of QCD's effective color field shows asymptotic behavior. That is

$$\alpha_s(q^2) = \frac{\alpha_s(q_0^2)}{1 + \frac{1}{4\pi}\alpha_s(q_0^2)\beta_0 \ln \frac{q^2}{q_0^2}} \quad (56)$$

in which β_0 is a constant given by the number of flavors.

Then, the molecular potential has to exhibit a similar asymptotic behavior, and it actually does as will be proven below. As we go to higher energies(i.e., to smaller r) there is more and more the influence of the superstrong force, which being repulsive, diminishes the strength of the strong force. As has been shown there should exist a molecular effective potential between two quarks whose mathematical expression may be very complicated. The effective force may even become zero at the bottom of each well. Just to show that the effective coupling constant diminishes with r let us approximate the effective potential by

$$V_{eff} = -\beta_s \frac{e^{-\mu_s r}}{r} + \beta_{ss} \frac{e^{-\mu_{ss} r}}{r} \quad (57)$$

where $\beta_s = (g_s^Q)^2(Q \text{ for quark})$, and $\beta_{ss} = (g_{ss}^Q)^2$ are the strong and superstrong couplings, respectively. But according to QCD the effective potential for small r should be given by

$$V_{eff} = -\frac{\alpha_s}{r}. \quad (58)$$

We expect that $\beta_{ss} \gg \beta_s$, and $\mu_{ss} \gg \mu_s$. Just to have a practical example, let us make $\beta_{ss} = 10\beta_s$ and $\mu_{ss} = 10\mu_s$. This means a boson with a mass of about 1.4 GeV. As we will see shortly this is very reasonable. Making $\beta_s = 1(\text{GeV})(\text{fm})$, and $\mu_s \approx 0.71\text{fm}^{-1}$, we obtain that α_s should be

$$\alpha_s = e^{-0.71r} - 10e^{-10r}. \quad (59)$$

The values of α_s for different values of r are shown in Table 4.1. We will see later on that the above values for β_{ss} and μ_{ss} agree quite well with supernovae data (see more on this in chapter 6). Since a baryon has 6 primons, the β_{ss} of each primon, β_{ss}^p , is about $\frac{1}{6}10(\text{GeV})(\text{fermi}) \approx 2\text{GeVfm}$. As we will see in chapter 10 there are about 20 repulsive terms between two nucleons. Therefore the effective superstrong coupling between two baryons is about $20 \times 2\text{GeVfm} = 40(\text{GeV})(\text{fm})$.

In momentum space the above effective molecular potential (Eq. 57) is³

$$V_q = -\beta_s \frac{1^{(1)} \cdot 1^{(2)}}{q^2 + \mu_s^2 - i\eta} + \beta_{ss} \frac{\gamma^{(1)} \cdot \gamma^{(2)}}{q^2 + \mu_{ss}^2 - i\eta} \quad (60)$$

where $q_\lambda = (\vec{q}, iq_0)$ is the four-momentum transfer and γ_λ are gamma matrices, and μ_{ss} and μ_s are the inverse Compton wavelengths of the superstrong and

strong(pions) bosons, respectively. In the nonrelativistic limit we can make the approximations $\gamma^{(1)} \cdot \gamma^{(2)} \rightarrow 1^{(1)} \cdot 1^{(2)}$ and $|q_0| \ll |\vec{q}|$. In this case, for high momentum transfer, that is, $q \gg \mu_{ss}, \mu_s$, if we expand in powers of $\frac{\mu_s^2}{q^2}$ and $\frac{\mu_{ss}^2}{q^2}$ up to second order we obtain

$$V_q = \frac{\beta_{ss} - \beta_s}{q^2} - \frac{\beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^2 - \beta_s\mu_s^2}{q^4}. \quad (61)$$

$r(\text{fm})$	$\alpha_s(\text{GeV}\cdot\text{fm})$
0.50	0.634
0.40	0.570
0.30	0.310
0.29	0.264
0.28	0.212
0.27	0.154
0.26	0.089
0.25	0.017
0.24	- 0.064
...	...

Table 4.1. An example of how the effective coupling constant(which is the result of the strong and superstrong interactions) varies with r . In this case the superstrong coupling constant is chosen to be 10 times the strong coupling constant and the ranges of the strong and superstrong interactions are 1.4 fm and 0.1 fm, respectively.

If the second term is very small the effective potential will be very close to QCD massless vectorial field. In order to achieve this it is enough to have $\beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^2 \approx \beta_s\mu_s^2$, that is,

$$\left(\frac{\mu_{ss}}{\mu_s}\right)^2 = \frac{\beta_s}{\beta_{ss}}. \quad (62)$$

Using the above figures we obtain $\frac{\mu_{ss}}{\mu_s} \approx \frac{1}{22}$, that is, we find that the boson of the new interaction has a mass of about 3GeV. Therefore, the higher the energy is, the better QCD gets because the molecular potential tends more and more to a constant, which is its bottom.

Let us now see the asymptotic behavior of the molecular potential. The expansion of $V(q)$ for high momentum transfer up to order q^6 is

$$V_q = \frac{\beta_{ss} - \beta_s}{q^2} - \frac{\beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^2 - \beta_s\mu_s^2}{q^4} + \frac{\beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^4 - \beta_s\mu_s^4}{q^6} - \dots \quad (63)$$

Making $V(q) = \frac{\alpha}{q^2}$ we have

$$\alpha(q^2) = \beta_{ss} - \beta_s - \frac{\beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^2 - \beta_s\mu_s^2}{q^2} + \frac{\beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^4 - \beta_s\mu_s^4}{q^4} - \dots \quad (64)$$

Making $\delta_0 = \beta_{ss} - \beta_s$, $\delta_2 = \beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^2 - \beta_s\mu_s^2$, $\delta_4 = \beta_{ss}\mu_{ss}^4 - \beta_s\mu_s^4$, ..., we get

$$\alpha(q^2) = \delta_0 - \frac{\delta_2}{q^2} + \frac{\delta_4}{q^4} - \dots \quad (65)$$

and

$$\alpha(q_0^2) = \delta_0 - \frac{\delta_2}{q_0^2} + \frac{\delta_4}{q_0^4} - \dots \quad (66)$$

Making $Q = q - q_0$, and dividing $\alpha(q^2)$ by $\alpha(q_0^2)$, we have

$$\frac{\alpha(q^2)}{\alpha(q_0^2)} = \frac{1 - \frac{a}{q_0^2} \left(1 + \frac{Q}{q_0}\right)^{-2} + \frac{b}{q_0^4} \left(1 + \frac{Q}{q_0}\right)^{-4} - \dots}{1 - \frac{a}{q_0^2} + \frac{b}{q_0^4} - \dots} \quad (67)$$

in which $a = \frac{\delta_2}{\delta_0}$ and $b = \frac{\delta_4}{\delta_0}$. For small Q we can expand the above expression and obtain

$$\frac{\alpha(q^2)}{\alpha(q_0^2)} = 1 + \frac{2Q}{q_0} \frac{1}{\Delta} \left(\frac{a}{q_0^2} - \frac{2b}{q_0^4} + \dots \right) + \dots \quad (68)$$

where $\Delta = 1 - \frac{a}{q_0^2} + \frac{b}{q_0^4} - \dots$. For Q small we also have

$$\ln \frac{q^2}{q_0^2} = 2 \ln \frac{q}{q_0} = 2 \left(\frac{Q}{q_0} - \frac{Q^2}{2q_0^2} + \frac{Q^3}{3q_0^3} - \dots \right) \approx 2 \frac{Q}{q_0}. \quad (69)$$

Finally we obtain

$$\frac{\alpha(q^2)}{\alpha(q_0^2)} \approx 1 + f(q_0) \ln \frac{q^2}{q_0^2} \quad (70)$$

or

$$\alpha(q^2) \approx \frac{\alpha(q_0^2)}{1 - f(q_0) \ln \frac{q^2}{q_0^2}} \quad (71)$$

with

$$f(q_0) = \frac{\frac{a}{q_0^2} - \frac{2b}{q_0^4} + \dots}{1 - \frac{a}{q_0^2} + \frac{b}{q_0^4} - \dots} \quad (72)$$

That is, the effective coupling constant of the molecular potential also shows an asymptotic behavior. And we can, then, ask which asymptotic behavior we are

really measuring, the asymptotic behavior of the color field or the asymptotic behavior of the effective potential? Or are we seeing the same thing?

References

1. G. Arnison, et al., Phys. Lett. 136B, 294(1984).
2. P. Bagnaia, et al., Phys. Lett. 138B, 430(1984).
3. R.C.Tolman, Phys.Rev. 55, 364(1939).

5 The Energies of Hadrons and the Electric Charge in Baryons

5.1 The Energies of Baryons

We will see below another evidence for the existence of the superstrong interaction, which is the calculation of the energies of baryons. As was shown above quarks are subject to attractive and repulsive forces. Therefore, we can propose that a sort of effective molecular potential well acts between any two of them. The expansion of such a potential about its minimum yields a harmonic oscillator potential. Thus, we may consider that every pair of quarks oscillates about an equilibrium distance r_q . For small departures from equilibrium the potential must be of the form

$$V(r) = V_o + K(r - r_q)^2 \tag{73}$$

where K is a constant and V_o is a negative constant representing the depth of the potential well. By doing so we are able to calculate the energies of baryons. The present treatment is very different from other calculations of baryon levels found in the literature. In those calculations ad hoc central harmonic potentials have been used.

As is well known there are several important works that deal with this problem. One of the most important is the pioneering work of Gasiorowicz and Rosner¹ which has calculation of baryon levels and magnetic moments of baryons using approximate wavefunctions. Another important work is that of Isgur and Karl² which strongly suggests that non-relativistic quantum mechanics can be

used in the calculation of baryon spectra. Other very important attempts towards the understanding of baryon spectra are the works of Capstick and Isgur³, Bhaduri et al.⁴, Murthy et al.⁵, Murthy et al⁶, and Stassat et al.⁷. An important work attempting to describe baryon spectra is the recent work of Hosaka, Toki and Takayama⁸ published in **1998**. This last work arrives at an important equation which had already been deduced by **De Souza a long time ago, in 1992⁹**. **Other works by De Souza published before 1998 include it^{10,11}**.

5.1.1 In Cartesian Coordinates In the initial calculation we use normal cartesian coordinates which, of course, does not consider the angular momentum of the system, that is, it does not take into account the symmetries of the system. But this section is very important because it calculates the energy levels. In the next section we will link each level to its angular momentum. Considering the work of Isgur and Karl² as to the use of non-relativistic quantum mechanics and using a deformed harmonic oscillator potential^{12,4,5,6} we can write the Hamiltonian in normal cartesian coordinates as

$$\sum_{i=1}^6 \frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \xi_i^2} + \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \left(E - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^6 \omega_i \xi_i^2 \right) \psi = 0 \quad (74)$$

where we have used the fact that the three quarks are always in a plane. The above equation may be resolved into a sum of 6 equations

$$\frac{\partial^2 \psi}{\partial \xi_i^2} + \frac{2}{\hbar^2} \left(E_i - \frac{1}{2} \omega_i \xi_i^2 \right) \psi = 0, \quad (75)$$

which is the equation of a single harmonic oscillator of potential energy $\frac{1}{2} \omega_i \xi_i^2$ and unitary mass with $E = \sum_{i=1}^6 E_i$.

The general solution is a superposition of 6 harmonic motions in the 6 normal coordinates. The eigenfunctions $\psi_i(\xi_i)$ are the ordinary harmonic oscillator eigenfunctions

$$\psi_i(\xi_i) = N_{v_i} e^{-(\alpha_i/2)\xi_i^2} H_{v_i}(\sqrt{\alpha_i}\xi_i), \quad (76)$$

where N_{v_i} is a normalization constant, $\alpha_i = \nu_i/\hbar$ and $H_{v_i}(\sqrt{\alpha_i}\xi_i)$ is a Hermite polynomial of the v_i th degree. For large ξ_i the eigenfunctions are governed by the exponential functions which make the eigenfunctions go to zero very fast.

The energy of each harmonic oscillator is

$$E_i = h\nu_i \left(v_i + \frac{1}{2} \right), \quad (77)$$

where $v_i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and ν_i is the classical oscillation frequency of the normal “vibration” i , and v_i is the “vibrational” quantum number. The total energy of the system can assume only the values

$$E(v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_6) = h\nu_1 \left(v_1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) + h\nu_2 \left(v_2 + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \dots + h\nu_6 \left(v_6 + \frac{1}{2} \right). \quad (78)$$

As was said above the three quarks in a baryon must always be in a plane. Therefore, each quark is composed of two oscillators and so we may rearrange the energy expression as

$$E(n, m, k) = h\nu_1(n + 1) + h\nu_2(m + 1) + h\nu_3(k + 1), \quad (79)$$

where $n = v_1 + v_2, m = v_3 + v_4, k = v_5 + v_6$. Of course, n, m, k can assume the values, $0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$. We may find the constants $h\nu$ from the ground states of some baryons. They are the known quark masses taken as $m_u = m_d = 0.31\text{Gev}$, $m_s = 0.5\text{Gev}$, $m_c = 1.7\text{Gev}$, $m_b = 5\text{Gev}$ and $m_t = 174\text{GeV}$.

The states obtained with the above Hamiltonian are degenerate with respect to isospin (if the quark masses are the same) so that our calculation does not distinguish between nucleonic and Δ states, or between Σ and Λ states. In the tables below the experimental values of baryon masses were taken from reference 13.

Let us start the calculation with the states ddu(neutron), uud(proton) and ddd(Δ^-), uuu (Δ^{++}) and their resonances. All the energies below are given in Gev. Because $m_u = m_d$, we have that the energies calculated by the formula

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + k + 3) \quad (80)$$

correspond to many energy states. The calculated values are displayed in Table 5.1. The last column on the right is a rough classification which will be cleared up in the next section. One observes in Table 5.1 that the particles that belong to it are N and Δ , which are particles that decay via the strong interaction either into N or into Δ (besides the electromagnetic decay, sometimes). For example

- $\Delta(1232) \rightarrow N\pi$;
- $N(1440) \rightarrow N\pi, N\pi\pi, \Delta\rho, N\rho$;
- $\Delta(1600) \rightarrow N\pi, N\pi\pi, \Delta\pi, N\rho, N(1440)\pi$;

Therefore, with the help of Table 8 we can easily understand the above decays. As we will see when a resonance decays into a particle of another table, then the decay is weak. For example, $\Delta(1905) \rightarrow \Sigma K$; $N(1650) \rightarrow \Lambda K$.

The energies of the particles Λ and Σ , which are composed of uus and uds are given by

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + 2) + 0.5(k + 1). \quad (81)$$

The results are displayed in Table 5.2. The agreement with the experimental values is excellent. As to the decay modes one observes the same as for N and Δ , that is, decays via the strong interaction go as $\Sigma \rightarrow \Lambda$ and $\Lambda \rightarrow \Sigma$. By means of the weak interaction the two particles decay into N and Δ .

n, m, k	$E_C(\text{Gev})$	$E_M(\text{Gev})$	Error(%)	$L_{2I,2J}$	Parity
0,0,0	0.93	0.938(N)	0.9	P_{11}	+
$n + m + k = 1$	1.24	1.232(Δ)	0.6	P_{33}	+
$n + m + k = 2$	1.55	1.52(N)	1.9	D_{13}	-
$n + m + k = 2$	1.55	1.535(N)	1.0	S_{11}	-
$n + m + k = 2$	1.55	1.6(Δ)	3.1	P_{33}	+
$n + m + k = 2$	1.55	1.62(Δ)	4.5	S_{31}	-
$n + m + k = 3$	1.86	1.90(N)	2.2	P_{13}	+
$n + m + k = 3$	1.86	1.90(Δ)	2.2	S_{31}	-
$n + m + k = 3$	1.86	1.905(Δ)	2.4	F_{35}	+
$n + m + k = 3$	1.86	1.91(Δ)	2.7	P_{31}	+
$n + m + k = 3$	1.86	1.92(Δ)	3.2	P_{33}	+
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.08(N)	4.1	D_{13}	-
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.09(N)	3.7	S_{11}	-
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.10(N)	3.2	P_{11}	+
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.15(Δ)	0.9	S_{31}	-
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.19(N)	0.9	G_{17}	-
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.20(N)	1.4	D_{15}	-
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.20(Δ)	1.4	G_{37}	-
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.22(N)	2.3	H_{19}	+
$n + m + k = 4$	2.17	2.225(N)	5.5	G_{19}	-
$n + m + k = 5$	2.48	2.39(Δ)	3.6	F_{37}	+
$n + m + k = 5$	2.48	2.40(Δ)	3.2	G_{39}	-
$n + m + k = 5$	2.48	2.42(Δ)	2.4	$H_{3,11}$	+
$n + m + k = 6$	2.79	2.7(N)	3.2	$K_{1,13}$	+
$n + m + k = 6$	2.79	2.75(Δ)	1.4	$I_{3,13}$	-
$n + m + k = 7$	3.10	3.100(N)	0	$L_{1,15}$?
$n + m + k = 8$	3.21	?	?	?	?
$n + m + k = 9$	3.72	?	?	?	?
$n + m + k = 9$	4.03	?	?	?	?
...

Table 5.1. Baryon states N and Δ . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + k + 3)$ in which n, m, k are integers. E_M is the measured energy. The error means the absolute value of $(E_C - E_M)/E_C$. We are able, of course, to predict the energies of many other resonances.

For the $\Xi^o(uss)$ and $\Xi^-(dss)$ baryons the energies are expressed by

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n+1) + 0.5(m+k+2). \quad (82)$$

See Table 5.3 to check the agreement with the experimental data. In this case the last column is almost empty due to a lack of experimental data.

State(n, m, k)	$E_C(Gev)$	$E_M(Gev)$	Error(%)	$L_{2I,2J}$	Parity
0,0,0	1.12	1.116(Λ)	0.4	P_{01}	+
0,0,0	1.12	1.193(Σ)	6.5	P_{11}	+
$n+m=1, k=0$	1.43	1.385(Σ)	3.2	P_{13}	+
$n+m=1, k=0$	1.43	1.405(Λ)	1.7	S_{01}	-
$n+m=1, k=0$	1.43	1.48(Σ)	3.5	?	?
0,0,1	1.62	1.52(Λ)	6.2	D_{03}	-
0,0,1	1.62	1.56(Σ)	3.7	?	?
0,0,1	1.62	1.58(Σ)	2.5	D_{13}	-
0,0,1	1.62	1.60(Λ)	1.2	P_{01}	+
0,0,1	1.62	1.62(Σ)	0	S_{11}	-
0,0,1	1.62	1.66(Σ)	2.5	P_{11}	+
0,0,1	1.62	1.67(Σ)	3.1	D_{13}	-
0,0,1	1.62	1.67(Λ)	3.1	S_{01}	-
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.69(Λ)	2.9	D_{03}	-
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.69(Σ)	2.9	?	?
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.75(Σ)	0.6	S_{11}	-
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.77(Σ)	1.7	P_{11}	+
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.775(Σ)	2.0	D_{15}	-
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.80(Λ)	3.4	S_{01}	-
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.81(Λ)	4.0	P_{01}	+
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.82(Λ)	4.6	F_{05}	+
$n+m=2, k=0$	1.74	1.83(Λ)	5.2	D_{05}	-

Continues on next page

State(n, m, k)	E_C (Gev)	E_M (Gev)	Error(%)	$L_{2I,2J}$	Parity
$n + m = 1, k=1$	1.93	1.84(Σ)	4.7	P_{13}	+
$n + m = 1, k=1$	1.93	1.88(Σ)	2.6	P_{11}	+
$n + m = 1, k=1$	1.93	1.89(Λ)	2.1	P_{03}	+
$n + m = 1, k=1$	1.93	1.915(Σ)	0.8	F_{15}	+
$n + m = 1, k=1$	1.93	1.94(Σ)	0.5	D_{13}	-
$n + m = 3, k=0$	2.05	2.00(Λ)	2.5	?	
$n + m = 3, k=0$	2.05	2.00(Σ)	2.4	S_{11}	-
$n + m = 3, k=0$	2.05	2.02(Λ)	1.5	F_{07}	+
$n + m = 3, k=0$	2.05	2.03(Σ)	1.0	F_{17}	+
$n + m = 3, k=0$	2.05	2.07(Σ)	1.0	F_{15}	+
$n + m = 3, k=0$	2.05	2.08(Σ)	1.5	P_{13}	+
0,0,2	2.12	2.10(Σ)	0.9	G_{17}	-
0,0,2	2.12	2.10(Λ)	0.9	G_{07}	-
0,0,2	2.12	2.11(Λ)	0.5	F_{05}	+
$n + m = 2, k=1$	2.24	2.25(Σ)	0.5	?	?
$n + m = 4, k=0$	2.36	2.325(Λ)	1.5	D_{03}	-
$n + m = 4, k=0$	2.36	2.35(Λ)	0.4	H_{09}	+
$n + m = 1, k=2$	2.43	2.455	2.5	?	
$n + m = 3, k=1$	2.55	2.585(Λ)	1.4	?	?
0,0,3	2.62	2.62(Σ)	0	?	?
$n + m = 5, k=0$	2.67	to be found	?	?	
$n + m = 2, k=2$	2.74	to be found	?	?	
$n + m = 4, k=1$	2.86	to be found	?	?	
$n + m = 1, k=3$	2.93	to be found	?	?	
$n + m = 6, k=0$	2.98	3.00(Σ)	0.7	?	?
$n + m = 3, k=2$	3.05	to be found	?	?	
$n = m = 0, k=4$	3.12	to be found	?	?	
$n + m = 5, k=1$	3.17	3.17(Σ)	0	?	?
$n + m = 2, k=3$	3.24	to be found	?	?	

Table 5.2. Baryon states Σ and Λ . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + 2) + 0.5(k + 1)$. E_M is the measured energy. The error means the absolute value of $(E_C - E_M)/E_C$.

State(n, m, k)	E_C (Gev)	E_M (Gev)	Error(%)	$L_{2I,2J}$	Parity
0,0,0	1.31	1.315	0.5	P_{11}	+
1,0,0	1.62	1.53	5.6	P_{13}	+
1,0,0	1.62	1.62	0	?	?
1,0,0	1.62	1.69	4.3	?	?
n=0, $m + k = 1$	1.81	1.82	0.6	D_{13}	-
2,0,0	1.93	1.95	1.0	?	?
n=1, $m + k = 1$	2.12	2.03	4.2	?	?
n=1, $m + k = 1$	2.12	2.12	0	?	?
n=3, $m = k = 0$	2.24	2.25	0.5	?	?
n=0, $m + k = 2$	2.31	2.37	2.6	?	?
n=2, $m + k = 1$	2.43	to be found	?	?	?
n=4, $m = k = 0$	2.55	2.5	2.0	?	?
n=1, $m + k = 2$	2.62	to be found	?	?	?
...

Table 5.3. Baryon states Ξ . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 0.5(m + k + 2)$. E_M is the measured energy. The error means the absolute value of $(E_C - E_M)/E_C$. The state $\Xi(1530)P_{13}$ appears to be the lowest state of the composite $\Xi \oplus \pi$. Its decay is in fact $\Xi\pi$.

In the same way the energies of $\Omega(sss)$ are obtained by

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + m + k + 3). \quad (83)$$

The energies are displayed in Table 5.4. The discrepancies are higher, of the order of 10% and decreases as the energy increases. This is a tendency which is also observed for the other particles. This may mean that, at the bottom, the potential is less flat than the potential of a harmonic oscillator. The decays occur as with the Ξ , that is, one sees weak, electromagnetic and strong decays into other particles such as Ξ and Λ .

State(n, m, k)	E_C (Gev)	E_M (Gev)	Error(%)
0,0,0	1.5	1.672	11.7
$n + m + k = 1$	2.0	2.25	12.5
$n + m + k = 2$	2.5	2.47	1.2
$n + m + k = 3$	3.0	to be found	?
...

Table 5.4. Baryon states Ω . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + m + k + 3)$, and E_M is the measured energy.

The energies of the charmed baryons($C = +1$) Λ_c^+ , Σ_c^{++} , Σ_c^+ and Σ_c^0 are given by

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + 2) + 1.7(k + 1). \quad (84)$$

The levels are shown in Table 5.5.

For the charmed baryons($C = +1$) Ξ_c^+ and Ξ_c^0 we have

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 0.5(m + 1) + 1.7(k + 1). \quad (85)$$

The results are displayed in Table 5.6.

As for the Ω_c^0 , its energies are

$$E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + m + 2) + 1.7(k + 1). \quad (86)$$

Table 5.7 shows the results of the energy levels.

State(n, m, k)	E_C (Gev)	E_M (Gev)	Error(%)
0,0,0	2.32	2.285(Λ_c)	1.5
$n + m = 1, k=0$	2.63	2.594(Λ_c)	0.1
$n + m = 1, k=0$	2.63	2.627(Λ_c)	0.01
$n + m = 2, k=0$	2.94	to be found	?
...

Table 5.5. Baryon states Λ_c and Σ_c . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + 2) + 1.7(k + 1)$. The state with energy 2.63 MeV had already been predicted in another version of this work. The experimental levels 2.594 MeV and 2.627 MeV have confirmed the theoretical values. It appears that the level $\Sigma_c(2.455)$ is a composition of the level (0, 0, 0)(that is the 2.285 Λ_c) with a pion as is also inferred from its decay.

State(n, m, k)	E_C (Gev)	E_M (Gev)	Error(%)
0,0,0	2.51	2.47(Ξ_c^+)	1.6
	2.51	2.47(Ξ_c^0)	1.6
1,0,0	2.82	to be found	?
0,1,0	3.01	to be found	?
...

Table 5.6. Baryon states Ξ_c . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 0.5(m + 1) + 1.7(k + 1)$. E_M is the measured energy. The recently found level $\Xi_c(2645)$ is probably a composition of the regular level Ξ_c^+ with a pion as its decay confirms.

State(n, m, k)	E_C (Gev)	E_M (Gev)	Error(%)
0,0,0	2.7	2.704(Ω_c^0)	0
$n + m = 1, k=0$	3.2	to be found	?
$n + m = 2, k=0$	3.7	to be found	?
...

Table 5.7. Baryon states Ω_c . The energies E_C were calculated according to the formula $E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + m + 2) + 1.7(k + 1)$. The energy of the level (0, 0, 0) above shown had been predicted in other versions of this work.

We may predict the energies of many other baryons given by the formulas:

- ucc and dcc, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 1.7(m + k + 2)$;
- scc, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + 1) + 1.7(m + k + 2)$;
- ccc, $E_{n,m,k} = 1.7(n + m + k + 3)$;
- ccb, $E_{n,m,k} = 1.7(n + m + 2) + 5(k + 1)$;
- cbb, $E_{n,m,k} = 1.7(n + 1) + 5(m + k + 2)$;
- ubb and dbb, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 5(m + k + 2)$;
- uub, udb and ddb, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + m + 2) + 5(k + 1)$;
- bbb, $E_{n,m,k} = 5(n + m + k + 3)$;
- usb and dsb, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 0.5(m + 1) + 5(k + 1)$;
- sbb, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + 1) + 5(m + k + 2)$;
- scb, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.5(n + 1) + 1.7(m + 1) + 5(k + 1)$;
- ucb, $E_{n,m,k} = 0.31(n + 1) + 1.7(m + 1) + 5(k + 1)$;
- ttt, $E_{n,m,k} = (174 \pm 17)(n + m + k + 3)$;
- and all combinations of t with u, d, c, s and b.

The first state(0,0,0) of udb which has an energy equal to 5.641GeV has been recently found. The above formula for this state yields the energy 5.62GeV. The error is just 0.3%.

5.1.2 In Polar Coordinates In order to address the angular momentum we have to use spherical or polar coordinates. Since the three quarks of a baryon are always in a plane we can use polar coordinates. We choose the Z axis perpendicular to this plane. Now the eigenfunctions are angular momentum eigenfunctions (of the orbital angular momentum). Thus, we have three oscillators in a plane. Considering that they are independent the radial Schrödinger equation for the stationary states of each oscillator is given by¹⁴

$$\left[-\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} - \frac{m_z}{\rho^2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \mu \omega^2 \rho^2 \right] R_{Em}(\rho) = E R_{Em}(\rho) \quad (87)$$

where m_z is the quantum number associated to L_z . Therefore, what we have is the following: three independent oscillators with orbital angular momenta \mathbf{L}_1 , \mathbf{L}_2 and \mathbf{L}_3 which have the Z components L_{z1} , L_{z2} and L_{z3} in the plane containing the quarks. Of course, the system has a total orbital angular momentum $\mathbf{L} = \mathbf{L}_1 + \mathbf{L}_2 + \mathbf{L}_3$ and there is a quantum number l_i associated to each \mathbf{L}_i . The eigenvalues of the energy are given by¹⁴

$$E = (2r_1 + |m_1| + 1)h\nu_1 + (2r_2 + |m_2| + 1)h\nu_2 + (2r_3 + |m_3| + 1)h\nu_3 \quad (88)$$

in which $r_1, r_2, r_3 = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $|m_i| = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots, l_i$. Comparing the above equation with the equation

$$E(n, m, k) = h\nu_1(n + 1) + h\nu_2(m + 1) + h\nu_3(k + 1),$$

we see that $n = 2r_1 + |m_1|$, $m = 2r_2 + |m_2|$, $k = 2r_3 + |m_3|$.

Let us recall that if we have three angular momenta L_1, L_2 and L_3 described by the quantum numbers l_1, l_2, l_3 the total orbital angular momentum L will be described by the quantum number l given by

$$l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq l \geq ||l_1 - l_2| - l_3| \quad (89)$$

where $l_1 \geq |m_1|$, $l_2 \geq |m_2|$, $l_3 \geq |m_3|$.

Taking into account spin we form the total angular momentum given by $\mathbf{J} = \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{S}$ and the quantum numbers of \mathbf{J} are $j = l \pm s$ where s is the spin quantum number. As we will see we will be able to describe all baryon levels.

a) Baryons N and Δ

Let us begin the calculation with the particles N and Δ . We will classify the levels by energy according to Table 5.1. The first state of N is the state ($n = 0, m = 0, k = 0$) with energy 0.93 GeV. Therefore in this case $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 0$ and then $l = 0$. Hence this is the positive parity state P_{11} and we have

l	N	Δ	Parity
0	0.938 P_{11}	?	+

The second energy level (1.24 GeV) which is the first state of Δ has $n + m + k = 1$. This means that $2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3| = 1$. Thus, $|m_1| + |m_2| + |m_3| = 1$ and $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq 1$, and we can choose the sets $|m_1| = 1, |m_2| = |m_3| = 0; |m_1| = |m_3| = 0, |m_2| = 1; |m_1| = 1, |m_2| = |m_3| = 0$, and $l_1 = 2, l_2 = l_3 = 0$, or $l_2 = 2, l_1 = l_3 = 0$, or still $l_3 = 2, l_1 = l_2 = 0$ which produce $l = 2$ and thus the level

l	N	Δ	Parity
2	?	1.232 P_{33}	+

In the third energy level (1.55 GeV) $n + m + k = 2 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3|$. This means that $|m_1| + |m_2| + |m_3| = 2, 0$ and we have the sets of possible values of l_1, l_2, l_3

l_1, l_2, l_3	2,0,0	0,2,0	0,0,2	1,1,0	1,0,1	0,1,1	0,0,0
l	2	2	2	0,1,2	0,1,2	0,1,2	0

in which the second column presents the values of l that satisfy the condition $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq 2, 0$. There are thus the following states

l	N	Δ	Parity
0	1.44 $P_{11}, 1.71P_{11}$?	+
1	1.535 $S_{11}, 1.65S_{11}$ 1.52 $D_{13}, 1.70D_{13}, 1.675D_{15}$	1.62 S_{31} 1.70 D_{33}	-
2	1.68 $F_{15}, 1.72P_{13}$	1.6 P_{33}	+

because we can have $j = 1/2 = 0 + 1/2 = 1 - 1/2; j = 3/2 = 1 + 1/2 = 2 - 1/2; j = 5/2 = 1 + 3/2 = 2 + 1/2$.

The fourth energy level (1.86 GeV) has $n + m + k = 3 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3|$ which makes $|m_1| + |m_2| + |m_3| = 3, 1$ and $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq 3, 1$. We have therefore the possibilities

l_1, l_2, l_3	l	l_1, l_2, l_3	l	l_1, l_2, l_3	l
3,0,0	3	2,0,1	3,2,1	0,2,1	3,2,1
0,3,0	3	1,0,2	3,2,1	1,0,0	1
0,0,3	3	1,2,0	3,2,1	0,1,0	1
2,1,0	3,2,1	0,1,2	3,2,1	0,0,1	1

and the states

l	N	Δ	Parity
1	$2.08D_{13}$	$1.90S_{31}$ $1.94D_{33}$	-
2	$1.90P_{13}, 2.00F_{15}, 1.99F_{17}$ $2.00F_{35}, 1.95F_{37}$	$1.91P_{31}, 1.92P_{33}, 1.905F_{35},$?	+
3	?	$1.93D_{35}$	-

In the fifth energy level (2.17 Gev) $n + m + k = 4 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3|$ which yields $|m_1| + |m_2| + |m_3| = 4, 2, 0$ and $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq 4, 2, 0$. We can then have $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 0$ ($l = 0$) and also

l_1, l_2, l_3	l	l_1, l_2, l_3	l
4,0,0	4	2,2,0	4,3,2,1,0
0,4,0	4	2,0,2	4,3,2,1,0
0,0,4	4	0,2,2	4,3,2,1,0
3,1,0	4,3,2	2,0,0	2
3,0,1	4,3,2	0,2,0	2
1,3,0	4,3,2	0,0,2	2
1,0,3	4,3,2	1,1,0	2,1,0
0,3,1	4,3,2	1,0,1	2,1,0
0,1,3	4,3,2	0,1,1	2,1,0

and hence the states

l	N	Δ	Parity
0	$2.10P_{11}$?	+
1	$2.08S_{11}, 2.20D_{15}$	$2.15S_{31}, 2.35D_{35}$	-
2	?	$2.39F_{37}?$	+
3	$2.19G_{17}, 2.25G_{19}$	$2.20G_{37}$	-
4	$2.22H_{19}$	$2.3H_{39}$	+

In the sixth energy level (2.48 Gev) $n + m + k = 5 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3|$ which produces $|m_1| + |m_2| + |m_3| = 5, 3, 1$ and $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq 5, 3, 1$. We have then the possibilities

l_1, l_2, l_3	l	l_1, l_2, l_3	l	l_1, l_2, l_3	l	l_1, l_2, l_3	l
5,0,0	5	1,4,0	5,4,3	3,0,0	3	1,3,0	4,3,2
0,5,0	5	1,0,4	5,4,3	0,3,0	3	1,0,3	4,3,2
0,0,5	5	0,4,1	5,4,3	0,0,3	3	0,3,1	4,3,2
4,1,0	5,4,3	0,1,4	5,4,3	3,1,0	4,3,2	0,1,3	4,3,2
4,0,1	5,4,3			3,0,1	4,3,2		

Thus we identify the states

l	N	Δ	Parity
2	?	$2.39F_{37}$	+
3	?	$2.40G_{39}$	-
4	?	$2.42H_{3,11}$	+
5	$2.60I_{1,11}$?	-

The seventh energy state (2.79 Gev) has $n + m + k = 6 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3|$ which produces $|m_1| + |m_2| + |m_3| = 6, 4, 2, 0$ and $l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq 6, 4, 2, 0$. We have then the possibilities below

l_1, l_2, l_3	6,0,0	0,6,0	0,0,6	5,1,0	5,0,1	1,5,0	1,0,5
l	6	6	6	6,5,4	6,5,4	6,5,4	6,5,4

and the states

l	N	Δ	Parity
4	?	?	+
5	?	$2.75I_{3,13}$	-
6	$2.7K_{1,13}$	$2.95K_{3,15}$	+

b) Baryons Σ and Λ

Now let us do the calculation for Σ and Λ . According to Table 5.2 the first energy state (1.12 Gev) is ($n = 0, m = 0, k = 0$) and hence we can have $l_1 = 0, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 0$ which yields $l = 0$ and the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
0	1.193 P_{11}	1.116 P_{01}	+

In the second energy level (1.43 Gev) $n + m = 1, k = 0$ which makes $2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2| = 1$ and $2r_3 + |m_3| = 0$. This actually makes $|m_1| + |m_2| = 1$ and $|m_3| = 0$. That is, we have the condition $l_1 + l_2 \geq 1, l_3 \geq 0$ which allows us to choose the possibilities

l_1, l_2, l_3	1,1,0	1,0,1	0,1,1
l	2,1,0	2,1,0	2,1,0

that produce the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
0	1.385 P_{13}	?	+
1	?	1.405 S_{01}	-
2	?	?	+

and the state 1.48 Σ is either $S_{13}, S_{11}(l = 1)$ or $F_{15}(l = 2)$.

In the third energy level (1.62 Gev) $n = m = 0, k = 1$ and we have $|m_1| = 0, |m_2| = 0$ and $|m_3| = 1$. That is, we have the condition $l_1 \geq 0, l_2 \geq 0, l_3 \geq 1$ which allows us to choose $l_1 = l_2 = 0, l_3 = 1; l_1 = l_3 = 1, l_2 = 0; l_1 = 0, l_2 = l_3 = 1$, and the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
0	1.66 P_{11}	1.60 P_{01}	+
1	1.62 S_{11} 1.58 D_{13}	1.67 S_{01} 1.52 D_{03}	-
2	?	?	+

and then the state 1.56 Σ is probably $F_{15}(l = 2)$.

The fourth energy level (1.74 Gev) has $n + m = 2 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2|$ and $k = 2r_3 + |m_3| = 0$, and thus we obtain $|m_1| + |m_2| = 2, 0$ and $|m_3| = 0$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 + l_2 \geq 2, 0$ and $l_3 \geq 0$. We can then choose $l_1 = 2, l_2 = l_3 = 0; l_1 = l_3 = 0, l_2 = 2; l_1 = l_2 = 1, l_3 = 0$ and thus we can identify the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
0	1.77 P_{11}	1.81 P_{01}	+
1	1.75 S_{11} 1.67 D_{13} , 1.775 D_{15}	1.80 S_{01} 1.69 D_{03}	-
2	?	1.82 F_{05}	+

and then the level 1.69 Σ is probably $F_{15}(l = 2)$.

In the fifth energy level (1.93 GeV) $n + m = 1 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2|$ and $k = 1 = 2r_3 + |m_3|$, and thus we obtain $|m_1| + |m_2| = 1$ and $|m_3| = 1$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 + l_2 \geq 1$ and $l_3 \geq 1$. We can then have the sets $l_1 = 1, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 1$; $l_1 = 0, l_2 = 1, l_3 = 1$. Both yield $l = 2, 1, 0$ and we can identify the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
0	1.84 P_{11} , 1.84 P_{13}	1.89 P_{03}	+
1	1.94 D_{13}	1.83 D_{05}	-
2	1.915 F_{15}	?	+

The sixth energy level (2.05 GeV) has $n + m = 3 = 2r_1 + |m_1| + 2r_2 + |m_2|$ and $k = 0 = 2r_3 + |m_3|$, and thus we obtain $|m_1| + |m_2| = 3, 1$ and $|m_3| = 0$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 + l_2 \geq 3, 1$ and $l_3 \geq 0$. We can then have the sets $l_1 = 2, l_2 = 1, l_3 = 0$; $l_1 = 1, l_2 = 2, l_3 = 0$ which make $l = 3, 2, 1$, for $l_1 + l_2 \geq 3$ and the sets $l_1 = 1, l_2 = 1, l_3 = 0$; $l_1 = 1, l_2 = 1, l_3 = 0$ which make $l = 2, 1, 0$, for $l_1 + l_2 \geq 1$. We can identify the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
0	2.08 P_{13}	?	+
1	2.00 S_{11}	?	-
2	2.07 F_{15} , 2.03 F_{17}	2.02 F_{07}	+
3	?	?	-

In the seventh energy level (2.12 GeV) $n = 0 = 2r_1 + |m_1|, m = 0 = 2r_2 + |m_2|, k = 2 = 2r_3 + |m_3|$ and thus $|m_1| = 0, |m_2| = 0, |m_3| = 2, 0$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 \geq 0, l_2 \geq 0$ and $l_3 \geq 2, 0$. We can then choose the sets $l_1 = 0, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 2$; $l_1 = 0, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 3$ which make $l = 3, 2$, and the states

l	Σ	Λ	Parity
$l = 2$?	$2.11F_{05}$	+
$l = 3$	$2.10G_{17}$	$2.10G_{07}$	-

Unfortunately, the angular momenta of the other energy levels have not been found but they can surely be explained according to what was developed above.

c) Baryons Ξ

For these baryons only some angular momenta are known. The first energy level (1.31 GeV) has $n = 0, m = 0, l = 0$ which make $l_1 = l_2 = l_3 = 0$ and $l = 0$ and is thus a P state. Therefore we obtain

l	Ξ	Parity
0	$1.318P_{11}$	+

In the second energy level (1.62 GeV) $n = 1 = 2r_1 + |m_1|, m = 0 = 2r_2 + |m_2|, k = 0 = 2r_3 + |m_3|$ and thus $|m_1| = 1, |m_2| = 0, |m_3| = 0$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 \geq 1, l_2 \geq 0$ and $l_3 \geq 0$. We can then have the sets $l_1 = 1, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 0; l_1 = 1, l_2 = 1, l_3 = 0$ which make $l = 2, 1, 0$, and the states

l	Ξ	Parity
0	$1.53P_{13}$	+
1	?	-
2	?	+

and thus the two levels 1.62 and 1.69 are probably either S, D or F states.

The third energy level (1.81 GeV) has $n = 0 = 2r_1 + |m_1|, m + k = 1 = 2r_2 + |m_2| + 2r_3 + |m_3|$ and thus $|m_1| = 0, |m_2| + |m_3| = 1$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 \geq 0, l_2 + l_3 \geq 1$. We can then have the sets $l_1 = 0, l_2 = 1, l_3 = 0; l_1 = 0, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 1$ which make $l = 1$, and the state

l	Ξ	Parity
$l = 1$	$1.82D_{13}$	-

In the fourth energy level (1.93 GeV) $n = 2 = 2r_1 + |m_1|, m = 0 = 2r_2 + |m_2|, k = 0 = 2r_3 + |m_3|$ and thus $|m_1| = 2, |m_2| = 0, |m_3| = 0$. Hence we have the condition $l_1 \geq 0, 2, l_2 \geq 0$ and $l_3 \geq 0$. We can then choose the set $l_1 = 2, l_2 = 0, l_3 = 0$ which produces $l = 2$, and the state 1.93 GeV is probably an F state.

5.1.3 Relation between energy and angular momentum From Eqs. 88 and 89 we have

$$E = (2r_1 + |m_1| + 1)h\nu_1 + (2r_2 + |m_2| + 1)h\nu_2 + (2r_3 + |m_3| + 1)h\nu$$

$$l_1 + l_2 + l_3 \geq l \geq ||l_1 - l_2| - l_3| \text{ with } l_1 \geq |m_1|, l_2 \geq |m_2|, l_3 \geq |m_3|.$$

in which l_1, l_2 and l_3 are the quantum numbers of the angular momenta \vec{L}_1, \vec{L}_2 , and \vec{L}_3 , and m_1, m_2, m_3 are the quantum numbers of their projections on the Z axis, respectively. Therefore, we clearly see that levels with large energies have large angular momenta as is quite evident from the experimental data.

5.1.4 The sizes of baryons The solution in Cartesian coordinates is also useful for calculating in a quite simple manner the average size of a baryon. As is known the average potential energy of each oscillator is half of the total energy, that is,

$$\langle \frac{1}{2}k\xi_i^2 \rangle = \frac{h\nu_i}{2}(v_i + \frac{1}{2}) \quad (90)$$

but since there are two directions for each quark in the plane there actually are two oscillators per quark and thus we have the potential energy E_q associated to each quark

$$E_q = h\nu_q(n_i + 1) \quad (91)$$

where $n_i = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $h\nu_q$ is the constituent quark mass constant. Thus taking into account Eq. 06 and the above fact on the relation between the total energy and the potential energy for an oscillator it can be written that

$$E(n, m, k) = h\nu_1(n + 1) + h\nu_2(m + 1) + h\nu_3(k + 1) =$$

$$= 2 \times (\langle \frac{1}{2}k_1\eta_1^2 \rangle + \langle \frac{1}{2}k_2\eta_2^2 \rangle + \langle \frac{1}{2}k_3\eta_3^2 \rangle) = \quad (92)$$

$$= \langle k_1\eta_1^2 \rangle + \langle k_2\eta_2^2 \rangle + \langle k_3\eta_3^2 \rangle$$

where $\eta_i^2 = \xi_{ij}^2 + \xi_{ik}^2$ in which j and k are the two orthogonal directions of the two oscillators. One can then make the association

$$h\nu_i(n + 1) = \langle k_1\eta_1^2 \rangle \quad (93)$$

and hence the average radius \mathcal{R} of a baryon can be given by

$$\mathcal{R}(n, m, k) = \left(\sqrt{\langle \eta_1^2 \rangle \langle \eta_2^2 \rangle \langle \eta_3^2 \rangle} \right)^{1/3} =$$

$$= \left(\sqrt{\frac{h\nu_1(n+1)}{k_1} \frac{h\nu_2(m+1)}{k_2} \frac{h\nu_3(k+1)}{k_3}} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (94)$$

It is quite obvious that the application of the above formula should be first done to the proton. In the fundamental level $n = m = k = 0$ and $h\nu_1 = h\nu_2 = h\nu_3 = 0.31\text{GeV}$, and making the reasonable supposition that $k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = k$, thus

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}(0, 0, 0) = \sqrt{\frac{h\nu_1}{k}}. \quad (95)$$

If one uses for the average size of a proton¹⁵ the figure of $\sqrt{0.72}\text{fm} = 0.85\text{fm}$ one has $k \approx 0.5\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$ which is a very reasonable figure because if it is multiplied by the characteristic distance of 1fm (of course!) the constant $k' \approx 0.5\text{GeV}/\text{fm}$ is obtained which is quite close to the value of the constant K used in the QCD motivated potential^{16,17}

$$V_{QCD} = -CF \frac{\alpha_s}{r} + Kr \quad (96)$$

which is assumed to be of the order of 1GeV/fm.

From Table 5.1 one has that for $n = m = k = 2$ the energy of a proton is about 2.80GeV which gives an average radius of about 1.39fm and hence one sees that the size of a baryon does not change much with the its energy. Therefore it can be said that the smallest radius of a proton is about 0.8fm and its largest radius is or the order of 1.4fm.

For the ground states of Σ^- and Ξ^- reference 15 gives, respectively, the radii $\sqrt{0.54}\text{fm} = 0.73\text{fm}$ and $\sqrt{0.43}\text{fm} = 0.66\text{fm}$. In terms of quarks Σ^- is *dus* and therefore one should have $k_2 = k_3$ and $k_1 \approx k \approx 0.5\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$ and

$$\mathcal{R}(n, m, k) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{h\nu_1(n+1) \times h\nu_2(m+1) \times h\nu_3(k+1)}{k_1(k_3)^2}} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (97)$$

Using the above value it is obtained that

$$0.73 = \left(\sqrt{\frac{0.31 \times 0.31 \times 0.5}{0.5 \times (k_3)^2}} \right)^{1/3}$$

which yields $k_3 = 0.80\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$. From Table 5.2 it is seen that for $n + m = 5$, $k = 1$, the energy is 3.17GeV which is the highest energy level up to now. If one takes, for example, $n = 2$, $m = 3$ one has an average radius of about 1.24fm. Also it is found that the average radii of Σ^- are much smaller than those of the proton for levels with the same quantum numbers n , m , k .

Now one can turn to Ξ^- which in terms of quarks is *dss*. Then it is expected to have the same $k_3 \approx 0.80\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$ (two of them) above and a new k , which can be called k_{ss} . Using the ground state radius of Ξ^- (0.66fm) one obtains $k_{ss} \approx 1.47\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$. For the excited states the average radius (in fm) is thus

$$\mathcal{R}(n, m, k) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{0.31(n+1) \times 0.5(m+1) \times 0.5(k+1)}{1.47(0.8)^2}} \right)^{1/3} \quad (98)$$

which for the highest known excited state 2.55GeV ($n = 4, m = k = 0$) gives $\mathcal{R}(4, 0, 0) \approx 1.48\text{fm}$. Using the value $k_{ss} \approx 1.47\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$ the radius of the ground state of Ω is estimated to be about 0.58fm.

Putting together the above values the very important table below is obtained for the constant k (which is a sort of constant of confinement) in terms of the pairs of interacting quarks.

Table 8. The harmonic oscillator constant k for some pairs of interacting quarks in terms of their reduced mass

	u-u	u-s	s-s
$k(\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2)$	0.5	0.8	1.47
μ (in GeV/c^2)	0.15	0.188	0.25

The table shows that k increases with the reduced mass of the pair of interacting quarks. When the data are fitted to a polynomial up to second order in the reduced mass of the pair of interacting quarks the following polynomial is obtained

$$k(\mu) = 0.1188 - 1.7561\mu + 28.6508\mu^2. \quad (99)$$

It is interesting that the coefficient of the last term is quite large and thus the first derivative increases very rapidly with μ . As more massive quarks are considered the degree of the polynomial may increase but just to have a lower bound one can calculate the value of k for the interaction between two top quarks. The above formula gives $k = 7416\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$. If the above data are fitted to a polynomial with a higher degree, for example, $k(\mu) = A + B\mu^2 + C\mu^3$, the following values are obtained: $A = -0.0268$, $B = 23.3794$, and $C = 0.2278$. Since the value of C is small and B is of the same order of 28.6508, the first polynomial (Eq. 99) is a good approximation. If it is used for obtaining the k between quarks u and c one has $k(uc) \approx 1.53\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$, $k(sc) \approx 3.7\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$, $k(cc) \approx 19\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$. And then one has that the radii of the ground states of the charmed baryons Λ_c^+ , Σ_c^{++} , Σ_c^+ and Σ_c^0 are about

$$R_c \approx \left(\sqrt{\frac{0.31 \times 0.31 \times 1.7}{0.5(1.53)^2}} \right)^{1/3} \approx 0.7\text{fm}$$

which is not so small due to the influence of the interaction between the two u quarks. As to Ω_c its ground state has a radius

$$R_{ssc} \approx \left(\sqrt{\frac{0.5 \times 0.5 \times 1.7}{1.53(3.7)^2}} \right)^{1/3} \approx 0.5\text{fm}$$

and the ground state of the ccc baryon has the quite small radius of just

$$R_{ccc} \approx \sqrt{\frac{1.7}{19}} \approx 0.3\text{fm}.$$

Since the value of $k(cc) \approx 19\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$ was obtained by means of an extrapolation the above figure of R_{ccc} should be taken as a crude approximation.

In the case of the ttt baryon an even cruder number is gotten for its radius because its value for k is expected to be larger than the above figure of $7416\text{GeV}/\text{fm}^2$, but it is instructive anyway to calculate its order of magnitude which in this case produces an upper bound for its radius. Therefore one can say that the radius of the ground state of the ttt system is

$$R_{ttt} < \sqrt{\frac{174}{7416}} = 0.15\text{fm}.$$

which is a very important number just because the top quark is the most massive quark.

Since in this work the motion of the plane where quarks are sitting was not taken into account conclusions can not be drawn on the shape of baryons using the above figures.

5.1.5 Spin-Orbit Interaction We clearly notice that the splitting of some levels are caused by the spin-orbit interaction. For example, consider the states $1.90S_{31}$ and $1.91P_{31}$ of Δ which differ by the values of $l = 1$ and $l = 0$, respectively. Since we are assuming a harmonic potential and as the spin-orbit term is proportional to $\frac{1}{r} \frac{dV}{dr}$ we can write

$$\Delta E_{SL} \approx C_1 \vec{S} \cdot \vec{L} = C [j(j+1) - l(l+1) - s(s+1)] \quad (100)$$

for N and Δ baryons which have quarks with equal masses. Using for the above case $j = 1/2, s = 1/2$ we find $C \approx 5\text{MeV}$ which shows that the influence of the spin-orbit interaction is small. Considering the levels $1.91P_{31}$ and $1.92P_{33}$ we find $C \approx 3.3\text{MeV}$ which is of the same order of the above C . The same holds in the case of the other baryons: for example, consider the states $1.75S_{11}$ and $1.77P_{11}$ of Σ or the states $1.80S_{01}$ and $1.81P_{01}$ of Λ . We see that there is a small energy difference between these states.

Concluding this section we can infer that the outstanding agreement with the experimental data implies that quarks do not move at relativistic speeds

inside baryons. As has been argued by Lichtenberg¹⁵ and others it is hard to see how $SU(6)$ is a good approximate dynamical symmetry of baryons if quarks move at relativistic velocities inside baryons.

We clearly see that the masses of baryons are expressed quite well by the simple model above described. It lends support to the general framework of having quarks as the basic building particles of baryons. Therefore, it agrees well with QCD.

It is not an easy task to include the anharmonicity of the potential but it is important to draw some conclusions on it because it is linked directly to the number of bound states. When we add a negative anharmonic term to a harmonic oscillator we obtain the energies¹⁶

$$E_n = C + h\nu \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) - A \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 \quad (101)$$

in which the third term takes into account the anharmonicity of the potential. This term can not be larger than the second term. Thus one should always have

$$n < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h\nu}{A} - 1 \right). \quad (102)$$

This n is the number of bound states. As we can see from the tables the anharmonicity is below 5% in general. Considering just one harmonic oscillator, the maximum value of n , that is, the number of bound states is about $\frac{1}{2}(20-1) \approx 10$. Of course this is just a rough number because there are more oscillators to take into account. But, anyway, the important conclusion is that a small anharmonicity allows many bound states. The lack of a significant anharmonicity implies that the potential is very symmetric, and this is expected since we are dealing with interactions between two quarks. As we will see shortly in the case of $q\bar{q}$ the potential is not as symmetric.

5.2 Generalization of the Gell-Mann-Okubo Mass Formula

The Gell-Mann-Okubo mass formula

$$M = M_0 + M_1 Y + M_2 \left(I(I+1) - \frac{Y^2}{4} \right) \quad (103)$$

where M_0 , M_1 and M_2 are suitable constants, I is the isospin, and Y is the hypercharge, has been widely used as a relation among the masses of baryon states belonging either to an octet or to a decuplet. This is a phenomenological formula “with no clear physical reasons for the assumptions on which it is based”²⁰. As we will show shortly the reason behind the above mass formula is the general formula for the mass of a baryon

$$E_{n,m,k} = \hbar\nu_1(n+1) + \hbar\nu_2(m+1) + \hbar\nu_3(k+1). \quad (104)$$

For the decuplet of $SU_3(u,d,s)$ Eq. (103) becomes

$$M = M_0 + M_1 Y \quad (105)$$

where Y is the hypercharge. The relation among the masses of baryons of the $SU_3(u,d,s)$ decuplet is given by

$$M_\Sigma - M_\Delta = M_\Xi - M_\Sigma = M_{\Omega^-} - M_\Xi. \quad (106)$$

According to Eq. (104) the equality of the first two terms of Eq. (106) is given by

$$0.31(n+1) + 0.5(m+k+2) + 0.31(n+m+k+3) = 2(0.31(n+m+2) + 0.5(k+1)) \quad (107)$$

which is satisfied for any n , and $m = k$. Actually, instead of Δ we may have either Δ or N . For example(see Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3),

- $n = 0, k = m = 0, 1.12 - 0.93 = 1.31 - 1.12 = 0.19;$
- $n = 0, k = m = 1, 1.93 - 1.55 = 2.31 - 1.93 = 0.38;$
- $n = 1, k = m = 0, 1.43 - 1.24 = 1.62 - 1.43 = 0.19;$
- $n = 1, k = m = 1, 2.24 - 1.86 = 2.62 - 2.24 = 0.38;$
- $n = 2, k = m = 0, 1.74 - 1.55 = 1.93 - 1.74 = 0.19;$
- $n = 3, k = m = 0, 2.05 - 1.86 = 2.24 - 2.05 = 0.19;$
- ...

The equality of the first term with the third term of Eq. (106) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0.31(n+m+2) + 0.5(k+1) - 0.31(n+m+k+3) = \\ 0.5(n+m+k+3) - 0.31(n+1) - 0.5(m+k+2) \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

which is satisfied for any n, m, k . Again, instead of Δ we may have N . For example(observe Tables 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4),

- $n = m = k = 0, 1.12 - 0.93 = 1.5 - 1.31 = 0.19;$
- $n = 0, m + k = 1, 1.43 - 1.24 = 2.0 - 1.81 = 0.19;$
- $n = k = 0, m = 2, 1.74 - 1.55 = 2.5 - 2.31 = 0.19;$
- ...

Finally, equating the second and third terms of Eq. (106) one obtains

$$0.5(n + m + k + 3) + 0.31(n + m + 2) + 0.5(k + 1) = 2(0.31(n + 1) + 0.5(m + k + 2)) \quad (109)$$

which is satisfied if $n = m$ for any value of k . As examples one finds (see Tables 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4)

- $n = m = k = 0$, $1.31 - 1.12 = 1.5 - 1.31 = 0.19$;
- $n = m = 0$, $k = 1$, $1.81 - 1.62 = 2 - 1.81 = 0.19$;
- $n = m = 1$, $k = 0$, $2.12 - 1.74 = 2.5 - 2.12 = 0.38$;
- ...

For an octet of $SU_3(\text{u,d,s})$ one obtains

$$3M_\Lambda + M_\Sigma = 2M_N - M_\Xi \quad (110)$$

which in terms of Eq. (104) becomes

$$2(0.31(n + m + 2) + 0.5(k + 1)) = 0.31(n + m + k + 3) - 0.31(n + 1) - 0.5(m + k + 2). \quad (111)$$

This equation is satisfied if $k = m$ for any n . For example, one has (see Tables 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3)

- $n = m = k = 0$, $2 \times 1.12 = 0.93 + 1.31$;
- $n = 1$, $m = k = 0$, $2 \times 1.43 = 1.24 + 1.62$;
- $n = 2$, $m = k = 0$, $2 \times 1.74 = 1.55 + 1.93$;
- $n = 3$, $m = k = 0$, $2 \times 2.05 = 1.86 + 2.24$;
- $n = 0$, $m = k = 1$, $2 \times 1.93 = 1.55 + 2.31$;
- $n = k = m = 1$, $2 \times 2.24 = 1.86 + 2.62$;
-

Let us now try to relate the constants M_0 and M_1 to the quark masses. Let us consider, for example, the decuplet of $SU_3(\text{u,d,s})$. In terms of the hypercharge the masses of the particles are described by

$$M_{\Omega^-} = M_0 - 2M_1; \quad (112)$$

$$M_\Xi = M_0 - M_1; \quad (113)$$

$$M_{\Sigma} = M_0; \quad (114)$$

$$M_{\Delta} = M_0 + M_1. \quad (115)$$

As we calculated above from the masses of Ξ , Σ and Δ one finds that $m = k$ (any n) and from the masses of Ω^- , Ξ and Σ one has $n = m$ (any k). Therefore, in terms of Y the masses of Ξ , Σ and Δ are given by

$$M_{n,m}(Y) = 0.31(n + m + 2) + 0.5(m + 1) - 0.19(m + 1)Y \quad (116)$$

and the mass of Ω^- is the above formula with $n = m$, that is,

$$M_{\Omega^-}(Y) = (1.12 - 0.19Y)(n + 1). \quad (117)$$

From the $SU(4)$ multiplets of baryons made of u , d , s , and c quarks, and considering Eq. (104) one obtains, for example,

$$M_{\Omega_{ccc}} - M_{\Xi_{cc}} = M_{\Xi_{cc}} - M_{\Sigma_c} = M_{\Sigma_c} - M_{\Delta}; \quad (118)$$

$$M_{\Omega_{ccc}} - M_{\Omega_{cc}} = M_{\Omega_{cc}} - M_{\Omega_c} = M_{\Omega_c} - M_{\Omega} \quad (119)$$

and

$$2M_{\Xi_{cc}} = M_{\Omega_{ccc}} + M_{\Sigma_c} \quad (120)$$

or more generally, one obtains

$$M_{q_1 q_1 q_1} - M_{q_2 q_1 q_1} = M_{q_2 q_1 q_1} - M_{q_2 q_2 q_1} = M_{q_2 q_2 q_1} - M_{q_2 q_2 q_2} \quad (121)$$

and

$$2M_{q_1 q_1 q_2} = M_{q_1 q_1 q_1} + M_{q_1 q_2 q_2} \quad (122)$$

in which we can consider $SU(6)$, that is, q_i may be u , d , c , s , b , and t . In the case of considering u and d , we may have the combinations ud , uu , and dd for $q_i q_i$. We also may have

$$M_{q_1 q_2 q_3} - M_{q_4 q_2 q_3} = M_{q_1 q_i q_j} - M_{q_4 q_i q_j}. \quad (123)$$

We conclude this section saying that the Gell-Mann-Okubo mass formula is a natural consequence of the pairwise interacting harmonic potential among quarks.

We find in the literature several relations among the masses of baryons. They are, actually, just special cases of the above formulas.

5.3 The Bound States of $Q\bar{Q}$ Mesons

According to QCD a meson is a colorless state which transforms under SU_3 as

$$q^{in} q_{jn} = \bar{q}_{in} q_{jn}.$$

Following the theory presented above it is reasonable to admit that there is also a sort of molecular potential in the interaction between a quark and an antiquark. Let us begin with the heavy mesons $c\bar{c}$ and $b\bar{b}$.

It is important to say that there are many important papers in the literature on the meson spectrum. One of the pioneers is the work of Eichten et al.²¹. Other important works are those of Godfrey and Isgur²², Gupta et al.^{23,24,25}, and Itoh et al.^{26,27}.

The $q\bar{q}$ potential is not known and some *ad hoc* potentials have been used, especially in the description of the energy levels of quarkonia. The most successful of all is a Coulomb-like potential with a confining term, the Cornell potential^{20,28}

$$V(r) = C - \frac{K}{r} + \frac{r}{a^2}. \quad (124)$$

The second term is completely justified in terms of the vectorial color field of QCD and, hence, we can make an analogy with the electromagnetic field. The confining term is not very consistent because it produces an enormous attractive quark-interquark force independent of r , but as we know the strong force decreases rapidly to zero when r is larger than a few fermi. Moreover it allows an infinite number of bound states which is not true. Actually the number of bound states is quite small.

We will see shortly that a much more realistic potential is a molecular-type potential like the Morse potential which is widely used in the description of the vibrational and rotational spectra of diatomic molecules. Actually, the Cornell potential is successful because it is close to Kratzer molecular potential²⁹

$$V(r) = -2D \left(\frac{a}{r} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{a^2}{r^2} \right). \quad (125)$$

which at the bottom is less roundish than Morse potential.

Taking into account a centrifugal term

$$V_c(r) = \frac{\hbar^2 \vec{L}^2}{2Mr^2}, \quad (126)$$

where M is the reduced mass of the system, and using non-relativistic quantum mechanics one obtains that either Morse or Kratzer potential produces the energy levels given by³⁰

$$\begin{aligned} E_{nl} = & C + h\nu \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) - A \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + Rl(l+1) \\ & - VR \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \left(l + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

where C , $h\nu$, A , R and VR are constants, and n and l are the integers $0,1,2,3,4,5,\dots$. The first term is a constant related to the depth of the potential, the second describes harmonic vibrations, the third term takes into account the anharmonicity of the potential, the fourth term describes rotations with constant moment of inertia, and the fifth term shows the coupling between vibrations and rotations. In this work the last term will be disregarded. The masses of all particles have been taken from reference 13.

5.3.1 Heavy Mesons

a) $c\bar{c}$ Bound States Let us consider the $c\bar{c}$ system first. The first two levels, $\eta_c(1S)(2979.8MeV)$ and $J/\Psi(1S)(3096.9MeV)$ are a hyperfine doublet, that is, the result of a splitting caused by the spin-spin interaction. The splitting can be calculated by

$$\Delta E_{\vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{s}_2} = A \frac{\vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{s}_2}{m_1 m_2} \quad (128)$$

in which

$$\vec{s}_1 \cdot \vec{s}_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}\hbar^2 & \text{for } S = 1 \\ -\frac{3}{4}\hbar^2 & \text{for } S = 0. \end{cases}$$

The difference between the two levels S_0 and S_1 is $117.1MeV$. Removing the splitting one has the degenerate level $c\bar{c}_0$ with an energy of $3096.9MeV - \frac{1}{4}117.1MeV = 2979.8MeV + \frac{3}{4}117.1MeV = 3067.6MeV$. The levels $\Psi(2S)(3686.0MeV)$ and $\Psi(3769.9MeV)$ are vector mesons. Taking the spin-spin energy off one obtains the energies $3686.0MeV - \frac{1}{4}117.1MeV = 3656.7MeV$, and $3769.9MeV - \frac{1}{4}117.1MeV = 3740.6MeV$. Applying our model to these three levels one has

$$C_c + h\nu_c \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_c \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 3067.6 \quad (129)$$

$$C_c + h\nu_c \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_c \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 3656.7 \quad (130)$$

$$C_c + h\nu_c \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_c \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 3740.6. \quad (131)$$

From these equations one obtains $C_c = 2583.6MeV$, $A_c = 252.6MeV$, and $h\nu_c = 1094.0MeV$. The constant C_c is positive just because we are actually considering the highest bound state with an energy of $3740.6MeV$, instead of zero because

it is close to the charmonium threshold. If we redefine the levels taking this into account the constant C_c becomes about - 1186.3MeV.

The third term in Eq. (127) can not be larger than the second term. Thus one should always have

$$n < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h\nu_c}{A_c} - 1 \right). \quad (132)$$

This n is the number of bound states. In this case one obtains

$$n < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1094}{252.6} - 1 \right) = 2.165 \quad (133)$$

which agrees quite well with reality since there are only three S_1 bound states ($n = 0, 1, 2$).

Let us now take into consideration the centrifugal term in Eq. (127), $Rl(l+1)$, and also the spin-orbit interaction $\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S}$. Since

$$\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S} = \frac{1}{2} \{J(J+1) - L(L+1) - S(S+1)\}, \quad (134)$$

one obtains a total contribution in energy of

$$B_c \{J(J+1) - S(S+1)\} + (R_c - B_c)l(l+1), \quad (135)$$

which is responsible for the splitting of the (1P) level into the three levels $\Xi_{c0}(1P)$ (3415.1 MeV), $\Xi_{c1}(1P)$ (3510.53 MeV), and $\Xi_{c2}(1P)$ (3556.17 MeV). One gets

$$B_c(0 - 1 \times 2) + (R_c - B_c)1 \times 2 = 3415.1 - 29.3 - 3067.6 = 318.2$$

$$B_c(1 \times 2 - 1 \times 2) + (R_c - B_c)1 \times 2 = 3510.5 - 29.3 - 3067.6 = 413.6$$

$$B_c(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + (R_c - B_c)1 \times 2 = 3556.2 - 29.3 - 3067.6 = 459.3.$$

From the first two equations one has $B_c = 47.7\text{MeV}$ and $R_c = 254.5\text{MeV}$. Using these values in the third level one obtains(in MeV) $47.7(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + 206.8 \times 1 \times 2 = 604.4$, instead of 459.3MeV, and one arrives at an energy of $3067.6 + 604.4 + 29.3 = 3701.3\text{MeV}$ for the level $\Xi_{c2}(1P)$. It is just over 3% off. The levels above the threshold can not be explained by our simple model.

b) $b\bar{b}$ Bound States Now let us consider the $b\bar{b}$ system. In this case there is not the scalar level η_b (which corresponds to η_c in charmonium), but the corresponding splitting between S_0 and S_1 would have an energy of about 80.0MeV. The three levels $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, and $\Upsilon(3S)$ correspond to $n = 0, 1, 2$ in

our potential model. They are all vector states. Taking the spin-spin interaction energy off, and applying Eq. (127) above one has

$$C_b + h\nu_b \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_b \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 9460.4 - \frac{1}{4}80.0 = 9440.4 \quad (136)$$

$$C_b + h\nu_b \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_b \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 10023.3 - \frac{1}{4}80.0 = 10003.3 \quad (137)$$

$$C_b + h\nu_b \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_b \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 10355.3 - \frac{1}{4}80.0 = 10335.3, \quad (138)$$

from which one obtains $C_b = 9072.4\text{MeV}$, $h\nu_b = 793.8\text{MeV}$, and $A_b = 115.5\text{MeV}$. Calculating the energy of the level with $n=3$ one gets 10435.8MeV . Adding the spin-spin interaction energy of about 20MeV one has 10455.8MeV which is quite close to the actual value of 10580.0MeV (error below 1%). It is important to notice that this level is actually slightly above the threshold. As done above the number of bound states is about

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{793.8}{115.5} - 1 \right) = 3.39.$$

Again this agrees with reality because there are only four S_1 bound states ($n = 0, 1, 2, 3$).

As in charmonium one can make the constant C_b negative subtracting the threshold energy from 9072.4MeV . One gets about $C_b = -488\text{MeV}$.

Let us now consider the centrifugal term in Eq. (127), $Rl(l+1)$, and also the spin-orbit interaction $\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S}$. As

$$\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S} = \frac{1}{2} \{J(J+1) - L(L+1) - S(S+1)\},$$

one obtains a total contribution in energy of

$$B_b \{J(J+1) - S(S+1)\} + (R_b - B_b)l(l+1), \quad (139)$$

which is responsible for the splitting of the $\Upsilon(1S)$ into the three levels $\Xi_{bo}(1P)$ (9859.8MeV), $\Xi_{b1}(1P)$ (9891.9MeV), and $\Xi_{b2}(1P)$ (9913.2MeV). One obtains

$$B_b(0 - 1 \times 2) + (R_b - B_b)1 \times 2 = 9859.8 - 20.0 - 9440.4 = 399.4$$

$$B_b(1 \times 2 - 1 \times 2) + (R_b - B_b)1 \times 2 = 9891.9 - 20.0 - 9440.4 = 431.5$$

$$B_b(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + (R_b - B_b)1 \times 2 = 9913.2 - 20.0 - 9440.4 = 452.8.$$

From the first two equations one obtains $B_b = 16.1\text{MeV}$ and $R_b = 231.8\text{MeV}$. Using these values in the third level one gets(in MeV) $16.1(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + 215.8 \times 1 \times 2 = 496.0$, instead of 452.8MeV , and an energy of $9440.4 + 496.0 + 20.0 = 9956.4\text{MeV}$ for the level $\Xi_{b2}(1P)$. It is just 0.2% off.

Doing the same for the splitting of the level $\Upsilon(2S)$ into the three levels $\Xi_{bo}(2P)$ (10232.1 MeV), $\Xi_{b1}(2P)$ (10255.2 MeV), and $\Xi_{b2}(2P)$ (10268.5 MeV), one gets

$$B'_b(0 - 1 \times 2) + (R'_b - B'_b)1 \times 2 = 10232.1 - 20.0 - 10003.3 = 208.8$$

$$B'_b(1 \times 2 - 1 \times 2) + (R'_b - B'_b)1 \times 2 = 10255.2 - 20.0 - 10003.3 = 231.9$$

$$B'_b(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + (R'_b - B'_b)1 \times 2 = 10268.5 - 20.0 - 10003.3 = 245.2.$$

From the first two equations one gets $B'_b = 11.6\text{MeV}$ and $R'_b = 127.6\text{MeV}$. Using these values in the third level one has(in MeV) $11.6(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + 127.6 \times 1 \times 2 = 301.6$, instead of 245.2MeV , and an energy of $10003.3 + 301.6 + 20.0 = 10324.9\text{MeV}$ for the level $\Xi_{b2}(2P)$. It is just 0.2% off.

Concluding one sees that this simple model gives very satisfactory results and describes well the $c\bar{c}$ and Υ mesons. This model can not be applied to the other heavy mesons due to the lack of experimental data, but we can guess that their bound states are probably the levels of a molecular potential.

5.3.2 Light Mesons

a) Kaons The first two levels, $K(494)$ and $K^*(892)$ are a hyperfine doublet, caused by the spin-spin interaction. Removing the spin-spin energy we get the K_0 level with energy equal to $892\text{MeV} - \frac{1}{4}398\text{MeV} = 494\text{MeV} + \frac{3}{4}398\text{MeV} = 792.5\text{MeV}$.

Doing the same with the levels $K(1460)$ and $K^*(1680)$ we obtain a degenerate level K_1 with energy equal to $1680\text{MeV} - \frac{1}{4}220\text{MeV} = 1460\text{MeV} + \frac{3}{4}220\text{MeV} = 1625\text{MeV}$.

Up to now no vectorial kaon with $J = 1$ (that is, a 1^{--}) has been found with energy close to 1800MeV but, as we see the splitting diminishes as the energy increases, and, thus the error will be small if we consider the energy of K_2 to be about 1830MeV .

Applying again the formula

$$E_{nl} = C + h\nu \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) - A \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 + \dots$$

to the three levels K_0 , K_1 and K_2 , we have

$$C_K + h\nu_K \left(0 + \frac{1}{2} \right) - A_K \left(0 + \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 = 792.5 \quad (140)$$

$$C_K + h\nu_K \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_K \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 1625 \quad (141)$$

$$C_K + h\nu_K \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A_K \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 1830. \quad (142)$$

The solution yields $C_K = 141\text{MeV}$, $A_K = 313.8\text{MeV}$, and $h\nu_K = 1460\text{MeV}$. The number of bound states is about

$$n \approx \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1460}{313.8} - 1 \right) = 1.8$$

which agrees quite well with reality since there are only three S_0 bound states ($n = 0, 1, 2$).

It is quite hard to relate the P , D , and F states to these levels. For instance, we expected 3D_3 to have an energy larger than 3D_2 , but, actually, it is the opposite way, the former has an energy of about 1816MeV (the $K_2(1820)$ meson) while the latter has an energy of about 1770MeV (the $K_3^*(1780)$ state). Maybe in this case there is an inverted spin-orbit interaction as in the case of nuclear levels.

b) η and ω Bound States In the case of light mesons our calculation using non-relativistic quantum mechanics is just a crude approximation because the velocities of the light quarks u and d are very high for energies above 100MeV . Since the $q\bar{q}$ system rotates about a center of mass, most of the velocity should be a transverse velocity, but the relative velocity along the line of the particles should also be high.

The mesons that we will consider are the states $\eta(548)$, $\omega(782)$, $\eta(1295)$, $\omega(1420)$, and $\eta(1760)$.

The first two levels, $\eta(548)$ and $\omega(782)$ are a hyperfine doublet, caused by the spin-spin interaction. Removing the spin-spin energy we get a degenerate level with energy equal to $782\text{MeV} - \frac{1}{4}234\text{MeV} = 548\text{MeV} + \frac{3}{4}234\text{MeV} = 723.5\text{MeV}$. Let us call as $\eta\omega_0$.

Doing the same with the levels $\eta(1295)$ and $\omega(1420)$ we obtain the degenerate level $\eta\omega_1$ with energy equal to $1420\text{MeV} - \frac{1}{4}125\text{MeV} = 1295\text{MeV} + \frac{3}{4}125\text{MeV} = 1388.7\text{MeV}$.

Up to now no vectorial ω with $J = 1$ (that is, a 1^{--}) has been found with energy close to 1800MeV but, as we see the splitting diminishes as the energy increases, and, thus the error will be small if we consider the energy of $\eta\omega_2$ to be about 1760MeV .

Applying the formula

$$E_{nl} = C_{\eta\omega} + h\nu \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \dots$$

to the three levels $\eta\omega_0$, $\eta\omega_1$ and $\eta\omega_2$, we have

$$C_{\eta\omega} + h\nu \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 723.5 \quad (143)$$

$$C_{\eta\omega} + h\nu \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 1388.7 \quad (144)$$

$$C_{\eta\omega} + h\nu \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 1760. \quad (145)$$

The solution produces $C_{\eta\omega} = 289.7\text{MeV}$, $A = 147\text{MeV}$, and $h\nu = 959.1\text{MeV}$. The number of bound states n is

$$n < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{959.1}{147} - 1 \right) = 2.8$$

which agrees quite well with reality since there are only three S_0 bound states ($n = 0, 1, 2$).

Again it is quite hard to relate the P , D , and F states to these levels. For instance, we expected 3P_2 to have an energy larger than 3P_1 , but, actually, it is the opposite way, the former has an energy of about 1270MeV (the $f_2(1270)$ meson) while the latter has an energy of about 1285MeV (the $f_1(1285)$ state). Maybe in this case there is again an inverted spin-orbit interaction as in the case of nuclear levels.

c) π and ρ Bound States As we said above this is a rough calculation, but it indicates quite well the number of bound states.

First we will consider the states $\pi(140)$, $\rho(770)$, $\pi(1300)$, $\rho(1450)$, and $\pi(1770)$. The first two levels, $\pi(140)$ and $\rho(770)$ are a hyperfine doublet, caused by the spin-spin interaction. The removal of the spin-spin energy produces the degenerate level with energy equal to $770\text{MeV} - \frac{1}{4}630\text{MeV} = 140\text{MeV} + \frac{3}{4}630\text{MeV} = 613\text{MeV}$. Let us call as $\pi\rho_0$.

Doing the same with the levels $\pi(1300)$ and $\rho(1450)$ we get the degenerate level $\pi\rho_1$ with energy equal to $1450\text{MeV} - \frac{1}{4}150\text{MeV} = 1300\text{MeV} + \frac{3}{4}150\text{MeV} = 1407\text{MeV}$.

No vectorial meson ρ with $J = 1$ (that is, a 1^{--}) has been found with energy close to 1800MeV but, since the splitting diminishes as the energy increases, the error will be small if we consider the energy of $\pi\rho_2$ to be about 1770MeV .

Applying the formula

$$E_{nl} = C_{\pi\rho} + h\nu \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + \dots$$

to the three levels $\pi\rho_0$, $\pi\rho_1$ and $\pi\rho_2$, we obtain

$$C_{\pi\rho} + h\nu \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(0 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 613 \quad (146)$$

$$C_{\pi\rho} + h\nu \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 1407 \quad (147)$$

$$C_{\pi\rho} + h\nu \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right) - A \left(2 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 = 1770. \quad (148)$$

The solution gives $C_{\pi\rho} = 54.3\text{MeV}$, $A = 215\text{MeV}$, and $h\nu = 1225\text{MeV}$. The number of bound states n is

$$n < \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1225}{215} - 1 \right) = 2.3$$

which agrees quite well with reality since there are only three S_0 bound states ($n = 0, 1, 2$).

It is quite hard to relate the P , D , and F states to these levels. Let us try to describe only the states $a_1(1260)$ and $a_2(1320)$. In order to do it we will take into consideration the centrifugal term $Rl(l+1)$, and also the spin-orbit interaction $\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S}$. Since

$$\vec{L}\cdot\vec{S} = \frac{1}{2} \{J(J+1) - L(L+1) - S(S+1)\},$$

we obtain a total contribution in energy of

$$B \{J(J+1) - S(S+1)\} + (R - B)l(l+1), \quad (149)$$

which is responsible for the splitting of the (1P) levels into the three levels $b_1(1235)$, $a_1(1260)$, and $a_2(1320)$. For the last two we have

$$B(1 \times 2 - 1 \times 2) + (R - B)1 \times 2 = 1260 - 770 = 490,$$

$$B(2 \times 3 - 1 \times 2) + (R - B)1 \times 2 = 1320 - 770 = 550.$$

Solving we obtain $B = 15\text{MeV}$ and $R = 260\text{MeV}$. This shows that the spin-orbit contribution is small while the rotational contribution is quite significant. The centrifugal energy is

$$V_c(r) = \frac{\hbar^2 \vec{L}^2}{2Mr^2}. \quad (150)$$

As we saw above it is about 260MeV , and $l(l+1) = 2$. Using for M a reduced mass of about $330/2 = 165\text{MeV}$, for quarks u and d we obtain

$$\left(\sqrt{\left\langle \frac{1}{r^2} \right\rangle} \right)^{-1} = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{MR}} = 0.98F, \quad (151)$$

which is quite consistent.

It is quite interesting that the potentials of all mesons are not symmetric due to the anharmonic term which should be of the type $-\beta x^3$ (with $\beta > 0$). Such a term makes the potential to be above the harmonic potential for $x < 0$, and below that of a harmonic potential for $x > 0$. This asymmetric part of the potential conveys the idea of a very strong repulsion for very close distances. How can we explain it with pointlike quarks? Clearly we can not. This is another evidence for quark composition and the superstrong interaction. As we saw in the case of baryons the potential is much less asymmetric than in the case of mesons. This difference comes from the fact that in the case of mesons the potential is between a quark and an antiquark. This reveals some features of the superstrong interaction.

5.3.3 The Sizes of Mesons

The centrifugal energy is

$$V_c(r) = \frac{\hbar^2 \vec{L}^2}{2Mr^2} = \frac{\hbar^2 c^2 e^4 \vec{L}^2}{2e^4 M c^2 r^2} = \frac{e^4 \vec{L}^2}{2\alpha^2 M c^2 r^2}$$

where M is the reduced mass. Using the calculated values of $\langle V_c(r) \rangle = R$ of section 5.3 we obtain the table below for $\left(\sqrt{\langle \frac{1}{r^2} \rangle}\right)^{-1}$ with $l = 1$:

Meson	$R(\text{MeV})$	$M(\text{MeV}/c^2)$	$\left(\sqrt{\langle \frac{1}{r^2} \rangle}\right)^{-1} (\text{F})$
$\pi\rho$	260	150	1.00
$c\bar{c}$	254.5	850	0.43
$b\bar{b}$	231.8	2500	0.26

These values are quite consistent. For $l = 0$ we expect much smaller values. Recall that r is the distance between q and \bar{q} .

Taking a closer look at the above table we notice that R does not change much and that it decreases slowly as the reduced mass M increases. Therefore, making an extrapolation we can say that it is about 250 MeV for light mesons and mesons with intermediate masses, and for $t\bar{t}$ it should be of the order of 200 MeV. Defining as a measure of the radius of the meson, rad , the expression

$$rad = \left(\sqrt{\langle \frac{1}{r^2} \rangle}\right)^{-1}$$

we can make an estimation of the radii of the other mesons for $l = 1$. Putting together the calculated values and the above values we have the table shown below:

Mesons	R (Mev)	Mc^2 (Mev)	radius(F)
$\pi\rho$	260	150	1.00
$\eta\omega$	~ 250	150	1.00
K^+, K^-, K^0, \bar{K}^0	~ 250	$\frac{0.3 \times 0.5}{0.3 + 0.8} = 0.188$	0.9
ϕ	~ 250	0.250	0.8
D^+, D^-, D^0, \bar{D}^0	~ 250	$\frac{1.7 \times 0.3}{1.7 + 0.3} = 0.255$	0.8
B^+, B^-, B^0, \bar{B}^0	~ 250	$\frac{5 \times 0.3}{5 + 0.3} = 0.283$	0.75
D_s^+, D_s^-	~ 250	$\frac{1.7 \times 0.5}{1.7 + 0.5} = 0.386$	0.6
$c\bar{c}$	254.5	850	0.43
$b\bar{b}$	231.8	2500	0.26
$t\bar{t}$	~ 200	87000	0.05

The numbers of the above table are quite important. There are some definite features. We see that light mesons and intermediate mesons have about the same size, ranging from 1F to 0.5F. It shows that the $b\bar{b}$ system is quite small and that $t\bar{t}$ is extremely small. Its radius agrees quite well with the approximate radius of the ttt baryon which is smaller than 0.15F. We now see that its radius should be of the order of 0.05F, that is, three times smaller than previously calculated. If we now go back to section 5.1.4 and use the radius of about 0.05F for ttt we obtain

$$k \approx \frac{174}{0.05^2} = 69600 GeV/F^2$$

which multiplied by its approximate radius yields a QCD-like K of about 3480 GeV/F. As we see the figure of 0.05F is close to the radius of the electron which is known to be smaller than 0.01F. The crucial difference is that the electron is very light while the ttt is extremely heavy. And since the top quark is the $p_1 p_4$ system primons are, for sure, point-like particles. Therefore, we can make the strong statement that more massive matter comes from less massive matter, that is, mass comes from within. This means that there should exist primordial, noncreated particles (with mass). They should be primons and leptons. We will see more on this in Chapter 7.

References

1. S. Gasiorowicz and J.L. Rosner, Am. J. Phys., **49**, 954(1981).
2. N. Isgur and G. Karl, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 4187 (1978).
3. S. Capstick and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. **D34**, 2809 (1986).
4. R.K. Bhaduri, B.K. Jennings and J.C. Waddington, Phys. Rev. **D29**, 2051 (1984).
5. M.V.N. Murthy, M. Dey, J. Dey and R.K. Bhaduri, Phys. Rev. **D30**, 152 (1984).

6. M.V.N. Murthy, M. Brack, R.K. Bhaduri and B.K. Jennings, *Z. Phys.* **C29**, 385 (1985).
7. P. Stassat, Fl. Stancu and J.-M. Richard, nucl-th/9905015.
8. A. Hosaka, H. Toki, and M. Tokayama, *Mod. Phys. Lett* **A13**, 1699 (1998).
9. M.E. de Souza, Proceedings of the XIV Brazilian National Meeting of the Physics of Particles and Fields, Caxambu, Minas Gerais, Brazil, September 29-October 3, p. 331(1993).
10. M.E. de Souza, in *The Six Fundamental Forces of Nature*, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, São Cristóvão, Sergipe, Brazil, February 1994.
11. M.E. de Souza, in *Some Important Consequences of the Existence of the Superstrong Interaction*, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, São Cristóvão, Sergipe, Brazil, October, 1997.
12. H. Toki, J. Dey and M. Dey, *Phys. Lett*, **B133**, 20 (1983).
13. Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.* **D54 (Part I)**, (1996).
14. R. Shankar, in *Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed., Plenum Press, New York, 1994, pp 316-317.
15. B. Povh, hep-ph/9908233
16. Fayyazuddin and Riazuddin, in *A modern Introduction to Particle Physics*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1992, pp 249-256.
17. D. H. Perkins, in *Introduction to High Energy Physics*, 3rd ed., Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc., Menlo Park, 1987, pp. 177-178.
18. D.B. Lichtenberg, in *Unitary Symmetries and Elementary Particles*, Academic Press, New York, USA(1970).
19. S. Flügge, in *Practical Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. I, Springer-Verlag, New York, USA, 1974, p. 186.
20. D.H. Perkins, in *Introduction to High Energy Physics*, Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, CA, USA, 1987, p. 152.
21. E. Eichten et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett*, **34**, 369(1975).
22. S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, *Phys. Rev.* **D32**, 189(1985).
23. S.N. Gupta, S.F. Radford, W.W. Repko, *Phys. Rev.* **D34**, 201(1986).
24. S.N. Gupta, J.M. Johnson, *Phys. Rev.* **D51**, 168(1995).
25. S.N. Gupta, J.M. Johnson, *Phys. Rev.* **D53**, 312(1995).
26. C. Itoh, T. Minamikawa, K. Miura, and T. Watanabe, *Nuovo Cimento* **105A**, 1539(1992).
27. C. Itoh, T. Minamikawa, K. Miura, and T. Watanabe, *Nuovo Cimento* **109A**, 569(1996).
28. Fayyazuddin and Riazuddin, in *A Modern Introduction to Particle Physics*, World Scientific, Singapore(1992), p. 256.
29. S. Flügge, in *Practical Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. I, Springer-Verlag, New York, USA, 1974, p. 178.
30. *Ibidem*, p. 180.

6 The Superstrong Force and the Universe

6.1 The Supernovae Evidence for the Superstrong Interaction

Type II supernovae release the enormous energy¹ of about 10^{51} ergs, which corresponds to initial shock velocities of 5×10^7 m/s. Several different models have attempted without success¹ to explain how the gravitational energy released during collapse could reach the outer layers of the star. Moreover it is not clear at all why the core explodes in the first place. No known theoretical model to date has been able to make the core collapse and “to produce both a gas remnant and a neutron star”¹. We may shed some light onto this issue by simply proposing that the explosion is caused by the superstrong interaction. The mechanism of the explosion may be as follows: Due to gravitational collapse all nucleons (and electrons) of the star get more and more squeezed up to the point that the repulsion caused by the superstrong interaction among the nucleons begins to play an important role because of the very small range of this new interaction. With further collapse a point is reached when the repulsion overcomes the gravitational attraction and a rapid expansion takes place in the core of the star while the outer layers are still collapsing. We will have, then, the shock of the outer envelope of the core with the inner envelope of the outer layer. If, at the moment of the shock, the velocities of the hydrogen atoms of the outer envelope of the core are much larger than those of the inner envelope of the outer layer, then there will not be any neutron star, and the gas will just expand and forms the gas remnant. If it happens the other way around or if the velocities of the two envelopes are similar then there will be the formation of a

neutron star because in this case the core bounces back. It is worth noting that the core may be formed only if all nucleons of its envelope collide at the same time(or almost) with the nucleons of the other envelope. This is only possible if the nucleons of the core form a gigantic spherical lattice. When the collision happens its effects in the inner layers of nucleons in the core are damped.

The energy of 10^{51} ergs corresponds to an energy of about 0.6MeV per baryon. A nucleon has a radius of about 1fm and the superstrong interaction will be dominant only if the nucleons are very close to each other. Taking the distance from their centers we may consider that when they are very squeezed they are separated by about 2fm(from center to center). This is consistent with nuclear physics data. Therefore, we can write

$$40(GeV) \frac{e^{-2\mu_{ss}}}{2} = 0.6(MeV) \quad (152)$$

where and μ_{ss} is given in fm^{-1} . The factor of 40 was taken from section 4.3. We obtain $\mu_{ss} \approx 5 fm^{-1}$, which means that the mediator of the new interaction has a mass of about 0.7 GeV. If nucleons get even more squeezed, separated by just 1fm(center-to-center) we obtain $\mu_{ss} \approx 11 fm^{-1}$ and a mediator with a mass around 1.5GeV. This is quite in line with what we calculated in chapter 3. Mediators with masses in this range abound: $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$, $D^*(2007)^0, D^*(2010)^\pm$, $D_1(2420)^0$, etc. It is important to say that the search for quark composition has been aimed at too high energies, in the TeV region. But, as we see, the superstrong bosons are not as massive.

These considerations are also in line with the repulsion which is one of the features attributed to the strong force at very small distances. Walecka² has developed a theory of highly condensed matter in the domain of the strong force assuming that the strong repulsion is due to the exchange of ω . He constructed a relativistic Lagrangian that allows nucleons to interact attractively by means of scalar pion exchange and repulsively by means of the more massive vector meson ω . At very high densities he finds that the vector meson field dominates and one recovers Zel'dovich result

$$P \rightarrow \rho c^2; v_s \rightarrow c. \quad (153)$$

where v_s is the thermodynamic speed of sound in the medium, P is the pressure, and ρ is the density. In his article he defines the two dimensionless coupling constants

$$c_s^2 = \frac{g_s^2}{\hbar c^3} \frac{M^2}{\mu^2}, \quad c_v^2 = \frac{g_v^2}{\hbar c} \frac{M^2}{m^2},$$

in which $\frac{g_s^2}{\hbar c^3}$ and $\frac{g_v^2}{\hbar c}$ are, respectively, the coupling constants of the strong(pionic) and vectorial fields, and M , μ and m are the inverse Compton wavelengths

$$M \equiv \frac{m_b c}{\hbar}, \quad \mu \equiv \frac{m_s c}{\hbar}, \quad m \equiv \frac{m_v c}{\hbar}$$

where m_b is the proton mass. Using data of nuclear matter he obtains $c_s^2 = 266.9$ and $c_v^2 = 195.7$. Considering that the vector field is actually caused by the superstrong interaction we observe that the value of c_v is consistent with the figures that we obtained for μ_{ss} and β_{ss}^2 . Therefore, Walecka's theory is essentially right.

Claims of the experimental discovery of a new interaction have been made by Baurov and Kopajev³(and references therein). According to them the new interaction is manifested by the magnetic activity of solar flares on the surface of the Sun. As they say "The new interaction must be very strong in that case because the vector potential \vec{A} of the tubes is of the order of $\sim 10^{11}$ Gs.cm ...". It may actually be the same superstrong interaction we have discussed above. Although it has been manifested on the surface of the Sun, its origin may be traced to its center where the density is of the order of the nuclear density. Moreover we may explain why it happens in flares in the following way: Due to gravitational contraction the density may increase momentarily to such a point that the superstrong interaction becomes important. This is especially true right at the center of the Sun. Then, the very squeezed baryons(nucleons) are expelled to the outer layers of the Sun due to their mutual repulsion, and, in such a process, we expect that the magnetic activity will increase and, thus, the solar flares are generated.

6.2 The Formation and Evolution of Galaxies

6.2.1 The Formation of Galaxies and Primordial Stars

The superstrong force explains the formation of galaxies in a quite easy way. As Márquez et al.⁴ and Yahil⁵ have shown, high redshift galaxies are very small, having diameters smaller than 1kpc. This is so because they are born as quasars which have sizes much smaller than 1kpc. In the beginning of the Universe, because of the repulsion caused by the superstrong interaction, the nucleons attained high velocities, of the order of supernovae', in the range of 10^4 km/s, but due to the action of the strong force this velocity diminished, and probably went down to 10^3 km/s. Gravity diminished further this velocity to the range 10^2 - 10^3 km/s, which is the range of the peculiar velocities of galaxies. Assuming $v \approx 10^3$ km/s, and using the virial theorem, we obtain that a newborn quasar had a radius

$$R \approx \frac{GM}{2v^2} \quad (154)$$

which is about 500 light years, where M is the typical mass of a galaxy(10^{11} suns). This is quite consistent with the data of Márquez et al.⁴ and Yahil⁵. In the data of Márquez et al. we see that some quasars have companion galaxies just some kpc away from them. For example, there is a galaxy only 28kpc away from the quasar 3C 215 and it is surrounded by 14 galaxies within $\pm 30''$. If

we assume that they are going away from each other with velocities around 10^3km/s , going backwards to the time when they were formed(touching each other), they had sizes of approximately 100pc , which is very consistent with the above calculation. This means that quasars(galaxies) were formed when the temperature was about 10^9K , just after the formation of the first light nuclei. The Universe was very young, less than a second old. Considering the typical number of baryons of a galaxy in a sphere with a radius of about 500 light years we obtain that the average distance among nucleons was only 10^{-4}m and corresponds to an average density of $\rho\approx 10^{-16}\text{kg/m}^3$. For $v\approx 10^3\text{km/s}$ we find that the Universe was about 10^{-11}s old. The size of an atom is about 1\AA , so that, atoms were formed 10^{-17}s after the Big Bang. The Big Bang was then a sort of supernova explosion. If we form an enormous squeezed nucleus with all baryons of the Universe we obtain a radius of about 50000km , which is approximately equal to Jupiter radius. It was not a black hole because it expanded due to the action of the superstrong interaction.

Let us now use Jeans criterion. The mass contained in a sphere of radius λ_J is the Jeans mass

$$M_J = \frac{4}{3}\pi\lambda_J^3\rho \quad (155)$$

where ρ is the density and λ_J is given by

$$\lambda_J = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{G\rho}}c_s \quad (156)$$

where c_s is the sound velocity. Using $c_s = 10^3\text{km/s}$ and the above figure for ρ we obtain $\lambda_J\approx 10^{19}\text{m}$ and $M_J = 10^{41}\text{kg}$ which is quite consistent with the virial theorem calculation. This M_J is the mass of a typical galaxy like the Milky Way, and 10^{19}m is about 300pc , which is about the size of a newborn quasar, as was shown above.

Very close to the beginning of the Universe, when the density was just above nuclear density (10^{18}kg/m^3) and the nucleons were still with supernova velocities of about 50000km/s we obtain $\lambda_J\approx 10^4\text{m}$ and $M_J\approx 10^{30}\text{kg}$. This M_J is the typical mass of a star like our Sun. This calculation means that quasars and stars were formed almost at the same time. These were the primordial stars. This is in line with the arguments and data of Shaver et al.⁶ and Pettini et al.⁷. Shaver et al. show in their work that the formation rate of stars and the space density of quasars peak at the same redshift($z\approx 2.5$) and have the same redshift dependence. This fact links the formation of quasars to the formation of primordial stars and rules out the existence of black holes. It is the superstrong interaction that avoids the formation of these hypothetical objects. Therefore, we should expect to have old stars and also neutron stars in the bulges of galaxies. Of course this is a quite known fact. For instance, very close to the center of the Milky Way there are very old stars.

This picture formation of stars and quasars allows the possibility of having neutron quasars which we may call *quasars*. They could provide the energy for

the very energetic cosmic rays and would provide quite a lot of dark mass.

6.2.2 The Evolution of Galaxies

The remarkable work of Márquez et al.⁴ has shown that very high redshift elliptical galaxies harbor quasars. They have also shown that such galaxies are very small (diameters smaller than 1kpc) and all of them are ellipticals. All the studied objects (about 15 quasars) have extended structures of ionized gas around them (this fact had already been presented by other researchers). They have found other galaxies in the fields of the studied objects only a few kpc away from them. Some of the quasars present asymmetric radio sources with collimated one-sided jets of extended ionized gas. This means that galaxies are born as quasars which become galaxies by means of the shedding of matter (ionized gas) from their cores as a result of the strong repulsion among their baryons caused by the superstrong interaction. The authors have found that the quasar 3C 281 is a double radio source. They also confirm the results of Miley and Hartsuiker⁸ that found that the quasar 3C 206 is also a classical double radio source. At such high redshifts it is very unlikely that this double source was caused by merging. It probably was caused by the breaking of the core of these quasars into two cores, separated by a very small distance. This breaking was caused by repulsion due to the superstrong interaction. The same kind of phenomenon has been observed in galaxies. For example, our well behaved normal galaxy M31 has two nuclei separated by just 5 light years⁹. Very recent data¹⁰ of NGC 6240, which is considered a typical protogalaxy, show that “approximately 70% of the total radio power at 20cm originates from the nuclear region ($\leq 1.5\text{kpc}$), of which half is emitted by two unresolved ($R \leq 30\text{pc}$) cores and half by a diffuse component. Nearly all of the other 30% of the total radio power comes from an arm-like region extending westward from the nuclear region”. A very important property of many quasars is their brightness which can vary from night to night. This flickering may have its origin in the outward motion of large quantities of matter from their cores. This brightness variability is also present in Seyfert galaxies which are powerful sources of infrared radiation. Many of them are also strong radio emitters. For example, over a period of a few months, the nucleus of the Seyfert galaxy M77 (or NGC1068) switches on and off a power output equivalent to the total luminosity of our galaxy¹¹. It is also worth noting that the nuclei of Seyfert galaxies are very bright and have a general starlike appearance. Researchers have found that some Seyfert galaxies exhibit explosive phenomena¹¹. For example, M77 and NGC4151 expel huge amounts of gas from their nuclei. The spectra of both galaxies show strong emission lines, just as quasars’. Shaver et al.¹² have found that there is a redshift cutoff in the number of quasars around $z = 2$, there is no quasar for $5 < z < 7$, and almost no quasar for $z < 0.5$. This clearly shows that quasars evolve into galaxies.

We can show a long list of similar phenomena that evidences the super-

strong interaction. Let us mention just some of them. NGC 2992 presents a jet-like structure and a circum-nuclear ring¹³. Falcke and Biermann¹⁴ report that there is a large scale emission-like jet going outward from the core of NGC 4258 with a mass of about 4×10^{35} kg and with a kinetic power of approximately 10^{42} ergs/s and expansion velocity of 2000 km/s. This is of the same order of supernovae velocities. It is well known that BL Lacertae objects are powerful sources of radio waves and infrared radiation. They share with quasars the fact of exhibiting a starlike appearance and of showing short-term brightness fluctuations. As some quasars do, they also have a nebulosity around the bright nucleus. Researchers¹⁵ have managed to obtain the spectrum of their nebulosity. *The spectrum of the nebulosity is strikingly similar to the spectrum of an elliptical galaxy* (M32's spectrum, in this case). In terms of the evolution above described they are simply an evolutionary stage of a quasar towards becoming a normal galaxy.

Radio galaxies share with BL Lacertae objects many of the properties of quasars. As Heckman et al.¹⁵ have shown, in the middle and far infrared (MFIR) quasars are more powerful sources of MFIR radiation than radio galaxies. Also, there have been investigations showing that the emission from the narrow-line region (NLR) in radio-loud quasars is stronger than in radio galaxies of the same radio power^{16,17,18}. Goodrich and Cohen¹⁹ have studied the polarization in the broad-line radio galaxy 3C 109. After the intervening dust is taken into account the absolute V-magnitude of this galaxy becomes -26.6 or brighter, which puts it in the quasar luminosity range. The investigators suggest that "many radio galaxies may be quasars with their jets pointed away from our direct line of sight". It has also been established that radio galaxies are found at intermediate or high redshifts and that they are clearly related to galactic evolution because as the redshift increases cluster galaxies become bluer on average, and contain more young stars in their nuclei. This is also valid for radio galaxies: the higher the redshift, the higher their activity. All these data show that a radio galaxy is just an evolutionary stage of a galaxy towards becoming a normal galaxy, i.e., it is just a stage of the slow transformation by means of an overall expansion of a quasar into a normal galaxy.

In the light of the above considerations the nuclei of old spirals must exhibit a moderate activity. This is actually the case. The activity must be inversely proportional to the galaxy's age, i.e., it must be a function of luminosity. The bluer they are, the more active their nuclei must be. As discussed above there must also exist a relation between this activity and the size of the nucleus (as compared to the disk) in spiral galaxies. Our galaxy has a mild activity at its center. Most of the activity is concentrated in a region called Sagittarius A, which includes the galactic center. It emits synchrotron and infrared radiations. Despite its large energy output Sagittarius A is quite small, being only about 40 light years in diameter. Besides Sagittarius A our galaxy exposes other evidences showing that in the past it was a much more compact object: 1) Close to the center, *on opposite sides of it*, there are two enormous expanding arms of hydrogen going away from the center at speeds of 53 km/s and 153 km/s; 2) Even closer to the center there is the ring called Sagittarius B2 which is

expanding at a speed of 110km/s^(11,20). It is worth noting that the speeds are low(as compared to the velocities of relativistic electrons from possible black holes). This phenomenon is not restricted to our galaxy. Recent high-resolution molecular-line observations of external galaxies have revealed that galactic nuclei are often associated with similar expanding rings²¹.

A new born quasar, as discussed above, must have most of its mass as hydrogen, the rest being the primordial helium. But close to its center there should also exist heavy elements. Therefore, it is mainly constituted of protons. We expect that different parts of it will be subjected to the superstrong force, especially close to its center where the gravitational field is small. The expansion of the quasar has to be, thus, from within, that is, from its center to its outer layers. The repulsion makes the quasar increase in size and go through the intermediate stages which may include radio galaxies and BL Lacertae objects. Far from the center big clumps of hydrogen and helium gasses form stars. Considering what is exposed above we may propose the following evolutionary scenarios described below.

Elliptical galaxy

A quasar may become an elliptical galaxy by expanding slowly as a whole. Because of rotation we may have several types of ellipticals according to their oblateness. As is well known ellipticals do not exhibit much rotation(as compared to spiral galaxies). This is explained as follows: As a quasar expands its angular velocity decreases because of angular momentum conservation. For example, the angular velocity of an EO must be given by(disregarding mass loss)

$$\omega_{EO} = \omega_Q \left(\frac{R_Q}{R_{EO}} \right)^2 \quad (157)$$

where ω_Q is the angular velocity of the quasar which gave origin to the galaxy; R_{EO} and R_Q are the radii of the elliptical galaxy and the quasar, respectively. Because $R_{EO} \gg R_Q$, $\omega_{EO} \ll \omega_Q$. This is consistent with the slow rotation of ellipticals. There is also the following consistency to be considered. Most galaxies in the Universe are ellipticals(about 60%) and as was shown above this means that most quasars expand slowly. Therefore, most quasars must not show rapid variability and must also be radio quiet. This is exactly what has been reported²². Another evidence to be taken into account is the reported nebulosity around some quasars. Boroson and Person²³ have studied this nebulosity spectroscopically. The emission lines they found are of the same type as the emissions from a plasma.

Spiral Galaxy

There are two possibilities in this case: normal spiral and barred spiral. This happens when, at some point in its expansion towards becoming a galaxy, a quasar expands rapidly by pouring matter outwards from its center, mainly in opposite sides across a diameter. This pouring will give origin to two jets which

will wind up around the central bulge because of rotation and will create the two spiral arms. A possible mechanism is the following: Due to rotation we expect to have some bulging in the spherical shape, and because of angular momentum conservation the outpouring of matter may only happen in a plane perpendicular to the axis of rotation. Because of rotation the core of the quasar becomes also an ellipsoid. This core(which has a higher concentration of baryons) may be broken into two parts, going to a state of lower potential energy(of the superstrong interaction). These two parts repel each other and form two centers(lobes) in the equator of the quasar(or young galaxy). The quasar 3C 281, for example, is a double radio source and has extended ionized gas around it⁴. These two lobes are also seen in many radio galaxies. As a consequence of the outpouring of matter from each center there must exist all kinds of radiations covering the whole electromagnetic spectrum, especially in the form of synchrotron radiation caused by collisions among atoms. Because of these collisions we expect to have electrons stripped from hydrogen and helium atoms. These electrons create the observed synchrotron radiation which is associated with jets in very active galaxies. These collisions provide also the enormous energy output observed in quasars.

Besides the slow outpouring of matter from their centers, their bulges should also expand as a whole by means of large amounts of matter which give origin to the globular clusters. This expansion probably happens in the beginning of the formation of the spiral. That is why the globular clusters are so old. As the galaxy ages the activity at the galactic center diminishes due to decrease of mass in the nucleus.

Barred spirals are galaxies that expel matter more vigorously. That is exactly why their arms are not tightly wound. As the galaxy ages the arms will curl up more and more and the bar will disappear because of the ejection of matter outwards. It is worth noting that the more spirals(including barred ones) are wound up the smaller are their nuclei and, conversely, the larger are their bulges, the less they are wound up. This happens because of the shedding of matter outwards from their nuclei throughout the galaxy's life due to the action of the superstrong force. The bar can be explained in terms of a more vigorous shedding of matter outwards as compared to the shedding that takes place in normal spirals. Therefore, as a spiral evolves its nucleus diminishes and the two arms become more and more tightly wound up. In summary, the evolution of galaxies probably follows one of the eight branches:

- i) Quasar(without jets) → BL Lacertae or radio galaxy →
→ { Seyfert Galaxies
→ Elliptical Galaxies → Spiral Galaxies
- ii) Quasar(without jets) → BL Lacertae or radio galaxy → { Seyfert Galaxies
→ Elliptical Galaxies
- iii) Quasar(without jets) → { Seyfert Galaxies
→ Elliptical Galaxies → Spiral Galaxies
- iv) Quasar(without jets) → { Seyfert Galaxies
→ Elliptical Galaxies

- v) Quasar(without jets) \rightarrow Elliptical Galaxies
- vi) Quasar(with jets) \rightarrow radio galaxy \rightarrow $\begin{cases} \text{Seyfert Galaxies} \\ \text{Spiral Galaxies} \end{cases}$
- vii) Quasar(with jets) \rightarrow $\begin{cases} \text{Seyfert Galaxies} \\ \text{Spiral Galaxies} \end{cases}$
- viii) Quasar(with jets) \rightarrow Spiral Galaxies.

Let us, now, make a general analysis including all kinds of galaxies. Considering the evolution above proposed we do not expect to have very small spiral galaxies because spirals must come from strong expulsion of matter from quasars nuclei, and this must happen only when the number of baryons is sufficiently large. This is the case, indeed, because dwarf galaxies are either irregular or elliptical galaxies. Ellipticals have masses in the range between 10^5 and 10^{13} solar masses while spirals' masses are comprised between 10^9 and 10^{11} solar masses. Also, we expect that spirals have faster rotations than ellipticals and, indeed, they do. This is just because the nuclei of spirals are smaller than the nuclei of ellipticals(for the same mass, of course). Therefore, spirals should have faster rotational velocities. It is also expected that, since spirals shed gas to their disks throughout their lifetimes, their disks must have young stars. This is an established fact. Our galaxy's disk, for example, has very hot, young(O-,B-, and A-type) stars, type-I Cepheids, supergiants, open clusters, and interstellar gas and dust. Each of these types represent young stars or the material from which they are formed. Conversely, the globular clusters and the nucleus contain older stars, such as RR Lyrae, type-II Cepheids, and long-period variables. This, of course, is a general characteristic of all spirals. For example, Young O- and B-type stars are the stars which outline the beautiful spiral arms of the Whirlpool galaxy. Because of the lack of gas(i.e., because of the lack of a disk) ellipticals also have primarily very old stars.

A very important support to the above evolution scheme is provided by the number-luminosity relation $N(> l)$. When expanded in terms of the apparent luminosity, l , the first term(Euclidean term) is given by²⁴

$$N(> l) = \frac{4\pi n(t_o)}{3} \left(\frac{L}{4\pi l} \right)^{1.5} \quad (158)$$

where $n(t_o)$ is the present density of galaxies and L is the absolute magnitude. The correction term is always negative, so that the number of faint objects(l small) should always be less than the number that the $l^{-1.5}$ predicts. This conclusion is strongly contradicted by observations on radio sources: many surveys of radio sources agree that there are more faint sources than the $l^{-1.5}$ law predicts. The fitting of the experimental data provides a law of the form²⁴

$$N(> l) \approx \frac{constan}{l^{1.8}}. \quad (159)$$

Since the formula breaks down for small l (i.e., faint distant sources), we must conclude that in the past radio sources were brighter and/or more numerous

than they are today. This, of course, lends support to the above evolutionary scheme.

It is worth mentioning that there is a very important drawback against the traditional view of explaining the formation of arms in spirals by the bulging effect of rotation. If this were the case we would find a higher proportion of pulsars off the galactic equator of our galaxy. But the real distribution reveals that these sources are mostly concentrated in the galactic equator. The traditional view does not explain either why all spirals have large amounts of gas in their disks. Besides, within the traditional framework quasars are just exotic objects. Evolution is clearly out of question without a repulsive short range force.

6.3 The Formation of Structure: Bubbles, Sheets and Clusters

Only clumps of matter exceeding the Jeans mass stabilize and virialize. Therefore, clumps of different sizes going apart from each other populated the young Universe. These clumps were quasars, young galaxies and groups of them with different numbers. Let us now turn to the present (local) Universe. The sizes of the biggest clumps can be calculated using Jean's criterion. With an overall average density of about 10^{-29}g/cm^3 and a sound velocity around 10^3km/s we obtain from Eq. 156 $\lambda_J \approx 10^{24} m \approx 67 \text{Mpc}$ which is of the order of magnitude of the largest voids. Solving for the ratio $v = d/t = 67 \text{Mpc}/10^{17} s$ we find $v = 2 \times 10^7 \text{m/s}$, which is quite reasonable with the above arguments and figures. As the density diminishes larger and larger structures are formed. When the density was higher the structures were smaller. For simplicity let us consider that the progenitor of a void was a spherical volume with a radius r . Since the volume of the void increases its density decreases and galaxies from different voids become clumped. This process generates underdense and overdense regions and the overall effect is the formation of clusters and superclusters. Of course, galaxies in clusters are accelerated due to their mutual attraction.

6.4 No Need of (for) Dark Matter

It has generally been argued that most of the matter of the Universe, from 80% to 90%, is dark matter which has quite unusual properties. For example, although it has to be very heavy it does not scatter radiation which is very contradictory. It is shown below that for closing the Universe there is no need of (for) dark matter.

Let us consider that the wall of a certain bubble of radius R has a thickness Δt . Assuming that $R \gg \Delta t$ the total mass of the wall is

$$M \approx \rho 4\pi R^2 \Delta t \tag{160}$$

where ρ is the density of matter in the wall and is at least $3 \times 10^{-28} \text{kg/m}^3$ ⁽²⁵⁾.

Therefore, the potential energy of a galaxy in the wall is

$$E_p \approx -\frac{Gm\rho 4\pi R^2 \Delta t}{R}. \quad (161)$$

Hence the total energy of the galaxy is

$$E \approx \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - \frac{Gm\rho 4\pi R^2 \Delta t}{R} = \frac{1}{2}mv^2 - Gm\rho 4\pi R \Delta t \quad (162)$$

where we have used Newtonian mechanics since space is flat on large scales. In order to have a closed Universe the maximum value V of v is then

$$V \approx \sqrt{\rho 8\pi G R_M \Delta t} \quad (163)$$

in which R_M is the maximum radius that the bubble can attain. If we take $R_M \approx 40\text{Mpc}/h^{(26)}$, $\Delta t \approx 5/h\text{Mpc}^{(27)}$ and for ρ the matter density from galaxies, we obtain $V \approx (350 - 600)\text{km/s}$ which is a quite reasonable figure and is of the order of the peculiar velocities of galaxies. If the Universe had nine times more mass V would be in the range $(1050 - 1800)\text{km/s}$ which would be quite off the mark. Hence, the mass that we have measured is approximately all the mass that actually exists and it does close the Universe. It may be slightly larger just because of the mass of brown stars. The above formula also shows that the velocities of galaxies in the wall increases with \sqrt{R} which is in good agreement with observations.

6.5 The Expansion of the Universe and the Background Radiation

It is quite remarkable the similarity between a supernova explosion and the Big Bang. In supernova debris we find sheets and filaments of gas, and underdense and overdense regions. We find the same in the large scale structure of the Universe: sheets, filaments and voids. There are more similarities. In supernova debris we find shells of gas expanding at speeds in the range $10^3 - 10^4\text{km/s}$. There are also shells in the Universe. As di Nella and Paturel²⁸ show "The distribution of galaxies up to a distance of 200 Mpc (650 million light-years) is flat and shows a structure like a shell roughly centered on the Local Supercluster (Virgo Cluster). This result clearly confirms the existence of the hypergalactic large scale structure noted in 1988. This is presently the largest structure ever seen." This is so because both explosions, either in supernovae or in the Universe, are caused by the same force: THE SUPERSTRONG FORCE. It is worth mentioning that the above picture of the universal expansion maintains nucleosynthesis untouched. We only have to reinterpret the cosmic background radiation(CBR).

The recent data of Mather et al.²⁹ on the CBR indicate a temperature $T_0 = 2.7\text{K}$. As we know the frequency at the peak of the spectrum, ν_{max} , is related to T by $\nu_{max}/T = 5.88 \times 10^{10}\text{Hzdeg}^{-1}$. On the other hand, during

collapse, the temperature and the density of a collapsing mass(supernova) obeys the equation³⁰

$$T = T_{c,i} \left(\frac{\rho}{\rho_{c,i}} \right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad (164)$$

where $T_{c,i} = 8.0 \times 10^9 \text{K}$, and $\rho_{c,i} = 3.7 \times 10^9 \text{gcm}^{-3}$, are the temperature and the density at the onset of collapse. Using the above equation for a density slightly higher than nuclear density, around 10^{15}gcm^{-3} , we obtain $T = 5.2 \times 10^{11} \text{K}$, and $\nu_{max} = 3 \times 10^{22} \text{Hertz}$, which corresponds to an energy of 124 MeV. This is quite close to the mass of pions. For example, the annihilation of π^+ with π^- produce photons with energies of about 140 MeV. Therefore, the primordial photons that produced the CMB may have been created by pion annihilation.

6.6 The Planetary Evidence for the Superstrong Interaction

As McCaughrean and Mac Low³¹ say “Mass outflow is known to be a common and perhaps inevitable part of star formation”. Edwards et al.³² also states that observations of young low-mass stars at optical, near-infrared, and millimeter wavelengths often reveal highly collimated bipolar jets and molecular outflows. And jets carry large amounts of energy and momentum from the central regions of young stellar objects³³(YSOs). Moreover, between 25% to 75% of YSOs in the Orion nebula appear to have disks³⁴.

It is very important to point out that no theory of planet formation is able to offer a reasonable explanation for the origin of the large amount of iron that is found in the cores of all planets, and the heavy elements(such as uranium) found on Earth and for sure in other planets. Of course, the jets and outflows mentioned above contain the planetary iron. How was it formed and expelled? We may explain it as follows: Because of inhomogeneities, when the solar nebular collapsed some parts of it got so squeezed that all heavy elements were formed and expelled due to the action of the superstrong interaction. That is, a small part of the sun suffered a supernova-like explosion. We easily observe that it was just a small ejection since the mass of all planets is only about one thousandth of the mass of the Sun. We expect that more massive stars eject more mass from their centers.

6.7 The Rotation of Spiral Galaxies

The rotational curve of spiral galaxies is one of the biggest puzzles of nature. It is possible to give a reasonable explanation for this puzzle in terms of the action of the superstrong force. In the process we will also explain the formation of the spiral structure of the arms.

First, let us consider the central nucleus(or bulge). The whole bulge expands slowly throughout the lifetime of a galaxy. For simplification let us consider a uniform density for the bulge. Because mass varies as r^3 and the gravitational force varies as r^{-2} we expect the tangential velocity to be proportional to r .

Now, let us consider the tangential velocities of stars in the disk. As was shown above the disk was formed by the shedding of matter from the center of the galaxy where a denser core existed. The mass is expelled with speeds in the range $10^2 - 10^3$ km/s. Let us consider that the bulge has a radius R_B and also that, because of the action of the superstrong force, a certain mass of gas m is expelled from the center(Fig. 6.1). Because of its radial velocity, the mass m will continue to distance itself from the bulge, but its tangential velocity is kept fixed because of the action of repulsion and because of the transfer of angular momentum from the bulge to the mass. This may be shown in the following way: As the mass goes away from the center it increases its angular momentum. At a distance r the angular momentum is given by

$$J = mrv_t \quad (165)$$

where v_t is the tangential velocity. Because J (of the mass m) increases with time(and with r) we have

$$\frac{dv_t}{v_t} > -\frac{dr}{r}. \quad (166)$$

Integrating, we obtain

$$\ln \frac{v_t}{v_{t_o}} > \ln \frac{r_o}{r} \quad (167)$$

where r_o is the position of the mass at a time t_o and r is its position at a later time. Both positions are measured from the center. Because the logarithm is an increasing function of the argument, we must have

$$\frac{v_t}{v_{t_o}} > \frac{r_o}{r}. \quad (168)$$

We clearly see that $v_t = v_{t_o}$ is a solution of the above inequality because r is always larger than r_o . Thus the mass m gains angular momentum. Because of conservation of angular momentum the galactic nucleus must decrease its angular momentum by the same amount. A recent study shows that the arms of spirals “transport angular momentum radially within galactic disks”³⁶. If we consider that the angular velocity of the nucleus does not diminish(which is more plausible than otherwise), then its mass must diminish, i.e., the nucleus needs to shed more matter outwards. Since v_t remains the same the angular velocity must decrease as the mass goes away from the center. This generates the differential rotation observed in all spiral galaxies. The formation of the spiral structure is, therefore, directly connected with the evolution of the galaxy.

We can easily show that the beautiful spiral arms are described by a logarithmic spiral(in an inertial frame). The angle θ measures the angular position

of m with respect to the center of the bulge and ϕ measures the angle in the bulge at position R where the mass left it. The angular velocity of the bulge is Ω . Let us consider that the tangential velocity of the mass m is a constant. Therefore, we obtain

$$r\omega = r \frac{d\theta}{dt} = R \frac{d\phi}{dt} = R\Omega = v_t = \text{constant} \quad (169)$$

where R is the radius of the galactic bulge and v_t is the tangential velocity of the mass m . We have that

$$d\theta = \omega dt = \frac{R\Omega}{r} dt = \frac{R\Omega}{rv_r} dr \quad (170)$$

where we have used the fact that $v_r = \frac{dr}{dt}$. Considering that v_r varies slowly with r (or t) we may integrate $d\theta$ and obtain

$$r \approx R e^{\frac{v_r}{v_t} \theta}. \quad (171)$$

This is the equation of the logarithmic spiral. We immediately obtain that

$$\omega \approx \Omega e^{-\frac{v_r}{v_t} \theta}. \quad (172)$$

We may also calculate ϕ . It is given by

$$\phi \approx \kappa \left(e^{\frac{\theta}{\kappa}} - 1 \right) \quad (173)$$

where κ is given by v_t/v_r .

The ratio $\kappa = v_t/v_r$ distinguishes between the two types of spiral galaxies. If $\kappa \ll 1$, then ω diminishes rapidly with θ . This corresponds to spirals with bars. Conversely, if $\kappa \gg 1$, then ω diminishes slowly and only reaches a very low value for large θ . This is consistent with the data on spiral galaxies. The middle ground $\kappa \approx 1$ corresponds to intermediate cases. A typical spiral without bars should have $\kappa \gg 1$.

Let us now consider the problem from the point of view of a frame fixed in the galactic bulge and rotating with it (Fig. 6.2). We may define an angle ψ related to θ and ϕ by $\psi = \phi - \theta$. Therefore, ψ is given by

$$\psi = \kappa \left(e^{\frac{\theta}{\kappa}} - 1 \right) - \theta.$$

For small θ one has $\psi \approx \theta^2/2\kappa$ and $r \approx R e^{\sqrt{\frac{2}{\kappa}} \psi}$ and for large θ we have $\psi \approx \kappa e^{\frac{\theta}{\kappa}}$ and $r \approx R \frac{\psi}{\kappa}$. Therefore, in this rotating frame the mass m also describes a spiral curve as it moves away from the center.

Let us now estimate the order of magnitude of the radial velocity of gas (and stars) in the galactic disk. The radius of our galaxy is 50000 light years and the age of our galaxy is of the order of magnitude of the age of the Universe, 10^{17} s. The gas which is at the edge of the disk must have moved from the center with a mean velocity of about 5km/s. Since the gas was expelled with much higher

velocities the mean velocity of stars far from the center are very small because the gravitational attraction slowed down the mass to very small velocities. The above figure is just a rough estimation. It is very important to obtain the mean radial velocities of stars in the spiral arms of the Milky Way to compare with it.

6.8 Black Holes Do Not Exist

There have been several reports in the literature attributing to black holes the infall of matter towards the centers of galaxies. Actually, as we will see below the infall of matter towards the centers of galaxies is an evidence of the existence of the superstrong interaction. And moreover, the infall shows that the superstrong force has a very small range.

A possible explanation on the subject is the following: due to the action of the superstrong force(repulsive) matter is expelled from the centers of galaxies, but it may fall back if it does not acquire enough speed to escape from the gravitational field of the center of the galaxy. And the fallback mimics the existence of a black hole.

The black hole is avoided because of the existence of the superstrong interaction. We can argue that such interaction has to exist to avoid such a thing as a black hole which violates many physical laws simply because it represents a cutoff in space time. Actually it is a cutoff from reality. Let us take a simple example. Let us suppose that a certain number of hydrogen atoms, for instance, fall into a black hole and disappears inside of it. What is done with conservation of energy and momentum? And what is then done with conservation of baryon number and lepton number? A more crucial question is the following: do particles exist at all inside black holes? From these questions and from several other ones we suspect that these exotic and *mathematical* objects do not exist. Nature has not reserved a role for them.

It is very important to have in mind that mathematical solutions have a broader scope than physical solutions simply because Nature is restrictive. That is, reality is restrictive. A mathematical theory can be wonderful from the intellectual point of view but it may be unphysical. *We can not force Nature to obey our theories and hypotheses.* We have to accept Nature as it is.

Let us make some calculations having in mind what has been argued and calculated in the previous sections and chapters. According to general relativity an object with a surface potential $V_S \gtrsim (GM)/(Rc^2)$ is a black hole. Let us consider, for example, an object with a mass of about a solar mass confined to a volume with a very small radius of just 1km. It has a density of about $\rho \approx 10^{17}g/cm^3$. This object has thus 10^{57} nucleons separated from each other by just 0.2 F. The superstrong force halts the collapse by means of the exchange of vector mesons. According to section 5.3 $b\bar{b}$ mesons are the main mediators in this case for their Compton wavelengths are about 0.126 F and their size is about 0.2F. We can also estimate the order of magnitude of the superstrong coupling $(g_{ss}^2)_{b\bar{b}}$ for $b\bar{b}$ mesons. In order to halt the collapse the overall repulsion due to

the superstrong interaction should be approximately equal to the gravitational energy, that is,

$$G \frac{M^2}{R} \approx n^2 (g_{ss}^2)_{b\bar{b}} \frac{4\pi}{\mu_{b\bar{b}}^2} \mathcal{V}. \quad (174)$$

The formula on the right is calculated in reference 37. As $\mathcal{V} = (4\pi/3)R^3$ and $n = N/\mathcal{V}$, we obtain

$$(g_{ss}^2)_{b\bar{b}} \approx \frac{GM^2 \mu_{b\bar{b}}^2}{4\pi R V n^2} = \frac{G m_p^2 \mu_{b\bar{b}}^2 R^2}{3} \quad (175)$$

where m_p is the proton mass. The above formula gives

$$(g_{ss}^2)_{b\bar{b}} \approx 6.2 \times 10^{-21}, Jm = 3.9 \times 10^4 GeV F. \quad (176)$$

In the case of $t\bar{t}$ mesons (size approximately equal to 0.007F) we obtain

$$(g_{ss}^2)_{t\bar{t}} \approx 10^7 GeV F. \quad (177)$$

The above figures are completely attainable.

A serious and definite blow on the black hole idea was the recent finding of an initial mass for the Universe³⁸ because at some point this mass was concentrated in a very small volume and, according to general relativity, it was a black hole. But the measurements are showing that it was not a black hole, and was rather just a soup of protons, neutrons and electrons.

References

1. S.L. Shapiro and S.A. Teukolsky, in *Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars*, John Wiley & Sons, New York(1983), p. 513.
2. J.D. Walecka, *Annals of Phys.* **83**, 491 (1974).
3. Yu. A. Baurov and A.V. Kopajev, hep-ph/9701369.
4. I. Márquez, F. Durret, and P. Petitjean, astro-ph/9810012.
5. A. Yahil, astro-ph/9803052.
6. P.A. Shaver, L.M. Hook, C.A. Jackson, J.V. Wall, and K.I. Kellermann, astro-ph9801211.
7. M. Pettini, C.C. Steidel, M. Dickinson, M. Kellogg, M. Giavalisco, and K.L. Adelberger, in *The Ultraviolet Universe at Low and High Redshift: Probing the Progress of Galaxy Evolution* (Eds. W.H. Waller et al.) AIP,1997.
8. G. K. Miley and A.P. Hartsuijker, *A & AS* **291**, 29 (1978).
9. T.S. Slatler, I.R. King, P. Krane, and R.I. Jedrzejewski, astro-ph/9810264.
10. E.J. M. Colbert, A. S. Wilson, and J. Bland-Hawthorn, *The Radio Emission from the Ultra-Luminous Far-Infrared Galaxy NGC 6240*, preprint network astro-ph; astro-ph/9405046, May 1994.
11. W. J. Kaufmann,III, in *Galaxies and Quasars*(W.H.Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1979).

12. P.A. Shaver, L.M. Hook, C.A. Jackson, J.V. Wall, and K.I. Kellermann, astro-ph/9801211.
13. S.C. Chapman, G.A.H. Walker and S.L. Morris, astro-ph/9810250.
14. H. Falcke and P.L. Biermann, astro-ph/9810226.
15. T. M. Heckman, K. C. Chambers and M. Postman, *Ap.J.*, **391**, 39(1992).
16. S. Baum and T. M. Heckman, *Astrophys. J* **336**, 702(1989).
17. N. Jackson and I. Browne, *Nature*, **343**, 43(1990).
18. A. Lawrence, *Mon. Not. R. Astr. Soc.*, 1992, in press.
19. R. W. Goodrich and M. H. Cohen, *Astrophys. J.* **391**, 623(1992).
20. Y. Sofue, *Astro. Lett. Comm.* **28**, 1(1990).
21. N. Nakai, M. Hayashi, T. Handa, Y. Sofue, T. Hasegawa and M. Sasaki, *Pub. Astr. Soc. Japan* **39**, 685(1987).
22. K. L. Visnovsky, C. D. Impey, C. B. Foltz, P. C. Hewett, R. J. Weymann and S. L. Morris, *Astrophys. J.* **391**, 560(1992).
23. T. A. Boroson and S. E. Persson, *Astrophys. J.* **293**, 120(1985).
24. M. V. Berry, in *Principles of Cosmology and Gravitation*, Adam Hilger, Bristol (1991), p.116.
25. Ibidem, p. 4.
26. H. El-Ad, T. Piran, and L.N. da Costa, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **287**, 790(1997).
27. M. Roos, in *Introduction to Cosmology*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester(1994), p. 5.
28. H. di Nella et G. Paturel, *C.R.Acad.Sci. Paris*, **t.319**, Série II, p. 57-62, 1994
29. J.C. Mather et al., *Astrophys. J.(Letters)* **354**, L37(1990).
30. S.L. Shapiro and S.A. Teukolsky, in *Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars*, John Wiley & Sons, New York(1983), p. 536.
31. M.J.McCaughrean and M.-M. Mac Low, astro-ph/9611058.
32. S. Edwards, T.P. Ray, and R. Mundt, in *Protostars and Planets III*, eds. E.H. Levy and J.I.Lumine (Tucson: University of Arizona Press), p. 567,1993.
33. G. Mellema and A. Frank, astro-ph/9710255.
34. C.F. Prosser, J.R. Stauffer, L. Hartmann, D.R. Soderblom, B.F. Jones, M.W. Werner, and M.J. McCaughrean, *Ap.J.* **421**, 517(1994).
35. S.L. Shapiro and S.A. Teukolsky, in *Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars*, John Wiley & Sons, New York(1983), pages 209, 210.
36. O. Y. Gnedin, J. Goodman, and Z. Frei, Princeton University Observatory preprint *Measuring Spiral Arm Torques: Results for M100*, astro-ph/9501112.
37. S.L. Shapiro and S.A. Teukolsky, in *Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars*, John Wiley & Sons, New York(1983), pp. 209,210.
38. C. Seife, *Science*, Vol. 292, No. 5518, p. 823 (2001).

7 Associated Fermions and the Hidden Realm of Gravity

7.1 Associated Fermions and the Dual Role of Neutrinos

Let us take a closer look at the table below which was considered in chapter I. At the center we find the structured states which are the different media. Let us begin discussing what happens in ordinary matter, for example, in a solid. In a solid the transport properties are mainly related to the motion of electrons(fermions) which are the carriers of the electric charge. Besides the carrier of the charge there is the carrier of the electromagnetic interaction which is the photon (boson). In the nucleus there is a similar pattern: the carriers of the strong charge(isospin) are the nucleons (fermions) and the carriers of the strong force are bosons (scalar mesons). In the quark we have that primons are the carriers of the superstrong charge and the carriers of the superstrong force are vector mesons(bosons). What about the galactic medium? Before answering this question let us recall that neutrinos are copiously produced in galaxies and fill in the Universe. And they are also produced in the weak decay of a neutron into a proton. Hence, we can say that an electron neutrino carries a superweak charge $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{N}\mathcal{N}}$ which is transferred to it from the neutron in the decay. Therefore electron neutrinos should be the charge carriers of the superweak charge and a new boson called *numeron* (derived from the latin *numerus* (number)) , \mathcal{N} , is the carrier of the superweak interaction. It is chosen with this name because it is related to the number of protons with respect to the number of neutrons. Hence we have found out why electron neutrinos fill in the universe.

We may call these fermions of *associated fermions* because they are associated to the fundamental forces. And there is always a quantized current linked to each associated fermion. *The four associated fermions primon, electron, nucleon and neutrino, are the only fermions that are stable.*

?	quark	nucleon
nucleon	nucleus	atom
atom	gas liquid solid	galaxy
galaxy	galactic medium	?

Table 1.1. The table is arranged in such a way to show the links between the structured states and the units of creation. The interrogation marks above imply the existence of prequarks and of the Universe itself as units of creation

The generalized fermionic current is therefore

$$j_V^\mu = q\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi \quad (178)$$

for the two vectorial fields (superstrong and electromagnetic) where q is the generalized charge (electromagnetic or superstrong), and ψ is the fermion Dirac spinor for electrons or primons.

For the pionic coupling between nucleons we have

$$j_{S,\pi N} = g_{\pi N}\bar{\psi}\gamma^5(\boldsymbol{\tau}\cdot\boldsymbol{\Phi})\psi \quad (179)$$

in which $g_{\pi N}$ is the strong charge, $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ are the isospin Pauli matrices, ψ is the nucleonic isospinor

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_p \\ \varphi_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (180)$$

and Φ is the isovector

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{\pi^+} \\ \phi_{\pi^0} \\ \phi_{\pi^-} \end{pmatrix} \quad (181)$$

where ϕ are pseudoscalar functions. We will deal with the superweak field in the next chapter. For now we can write just a general and unpretentious expression for the superweak current such as

$$j_{S,NN} = \mathcal{G}_{NN} \bar{\psi} \gamma^5 \Phi_N \psi \quad (182)$$

where \mathcal{G}_{NN} is the superweak coupling constant, ψ is the same as above, a nucleonic isospinor

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_p \\ \varphi_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (183)$$

and Φ_N is a scalar function. We see that

$$j_{S,NN} = \mathcal{G}_{NN} \phi_p \Phi_N \phi_n + \mathcal{G}_{NN} \phi_n \Phi_N \phi_p \quad (184)$$

since the superweak neutrino current happens only when a proton interacts with a neutron or vice versa.

As we saw in chapters 2 and 3 primons also carry scalar currents. Therefore, there is then a strong scalar current of primons similar to that given by Eq.(182).

The existence of the fermionic currents above mentioned means that the corresponding charges are quantized, that is, there is always a charge unit. For example, for the electric charge the electron's is the minimum one.

We can then construct the table on the next page for the associated fermions and the fundamental forces. In it we notice that the weak force is different from the four forces above mentioned because it has neutrino weak currents and electronic weak currents as well. Therefore neutrinos have a dual role since they are one of the charge carriers of the weak force and also the carrier of the superweak charge. The gravitational force appears to belong to a very special class as will be shown below. The strong force is also special in the sense that it has an associated fermion (the primon) in the confined world and another associated fermion (the nucleon) for the ordinary world. Maybe the Higgs bosons should be classified as a strong boson.

The table points towards an important trend: primons, nucleons and electron have masses, and thus, the neutrino should have a mass too.

Fundamental Force	Interaction Carriers (Bosons)	Charge Carriers (Stable Fermions)
Superstrong	supergluons, $\rho(770)$, $\omega(782)$, $\phi(1020)$, $K^*(892)$, $D^*(2007)^0$, $D^*(2010)^\pm$, $J/\psi(1S)$, $\psi(2S)$, $\psi(3700)$, $\psi(4040)$, $\Upsilon(1S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, $\Upsilon(3S)$, $\Upsilon(4S)$,	primons
Strong	π^\pm , π^0 , η , K^\pm , K^0 , \bar{K}^0 , D^\pm , D^0 , \bar{D}^0 , D_s^+ , D_s^- , B^+ , B^- , B^0 , \bar{B}^0 , B_s^0 , \bar{B}_s^0 , $\eta_c(1S)$	primons and nucleons
Electromagnetic	γ	electron
Superweak	\mathcal{N}	neutrino(ν_e)
Weak	Z^0 , W^\pm	neutrino and electron
Gravity	graviton?	?

Table 7.1. Table of the Fundamental Forces, Interaction Bosons, and Associated Fermions. We notice that the weak interaction is special and that the gravitational interaction is more than special and very strange if its associated fermion does not exist.

7.2 The Hidden Realm of Gravity

Following the reasoning above developed we may ask if gravity has a charge carrier. If it has one it is not known yet. But we suspect that such fermion does not exist (except inside hadrons) because massless particles are attracted gravitationally by a massive particle, as general relativity shows it, and as the experiments have revealed. According to general relativity the 4-momentum of a freely moving photon is written as¹

$$\nabla_p p = 0 \quad (185)$$

where the four-momentum of the photon is $p = \frac{d}{d\lambda}$ and λ is an affine parameter. This geodesic equation can be written as

$$\frac{dp^\alpha}{d\lambda^*} + \Gamma_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha p^\beta p^\gamma = 0 \quad (186)$$

from which we calculate that a photon (*zero mass*) suffers a deflection given by the angle

$$\Delta\phi = 4M/b = 1''.75(R_\odot/b) \quad (187)$$

in which M is the sun's mass, R_\odot is the sun's radius and b is the impact parameter. This means that even particles with gravitational "charge" equal to zero suffer the influence of gravity. On the other hand in Newtonian gravity we have that the gravitational potential energy between two massive bodies is

$$E_p = -G \frac{m_1 m_2}{r} \quad (188)$$

which is of Yukawa type. According to this equation the two masses are the two gravitational charges. But since we do not have a fermionic mass carrier we cannot write each mass as a multiple of the fermion mass. Therefore, mass cannot be quantized. Without the fermionic mass carrier we cannot have mass currents. How can gravity be quantized without quantizing mass and without fermionic currents?

Let us see what we arrive at if we admit the existence of such a mass carrier. Let us call it *masson*. Following section 7.1 we may suppose it is a 1/2 spin fermion. Since it is a fermion it has to satisfy Dirac equation which written in covariant form is (a free fermion)

$$(i\hbar\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - mc)\psi = 0. \quad (189)$$

But it should also satisfy a four-vector mass current

$$j^\mu = cm\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi \quad (190)$$

because the mass is also the charge. Multiplying Dirac equation above from the left by $\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu$ we have

$$i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi = j^\mu = cm\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi. \quad (191)$$

which shows that the mass comes from the variation of ψ .

The mass has to be extremely light and we expect it to interact with vacuum. Let us consider that it suffers the action of an effective vacuum potential Φ_V which is capable of creating mass, that is,

$$\Phi_V\psi = nmc\psi \quad (192)$$

where n is an integer because m is supposedly the quantum of mass. Thus we can write

$$i\hbar\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi - mc\psi + \Phi_V\psi = i\hbar\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi - mc\psi + nmc\psi = 0. \quad (193)$$

In the case of minimum creation $n = 1$, that is, we obtain

$$i\hbar\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu\psi = 0$$

and

$$j^\mu = 0 \quad (194)$$

which is quite contradictory because it means that the creation of mass does not generate any mass current. We see then that mass creation from pure vacuum does not make any sense.

From Dirac equation we have $i\hbar\gamma^\nu\partial_\nu\psi = cm\psi$ and

$$i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu\partial_\nu\psi = cm\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi = j^\mu$$

As $\gamma_\mu\gamma^\mu = 4$, we can write

$$i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu\partial_\nu(\gamma_\mu\gamma^\mu\psi) = i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu(\gamma^\mu\psi) = 4mc\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi. \quad (195)$$

Since $\gamma^\mu\psi$ is also a solution of Dirac equation we obtain

$$i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\nu\partial_\nu(\gamma^\mu\psi) = mc\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi \quad (196)$$

and

$$i\hbar\bar{\psi}\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu(\gamma^\mu\psi) = 4mc\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi \quad (197)$$

Since $\gamma^\nu\gamma^\mu + \gamma^\mu\gamma^\nu = 2g^{\nu\mu}$, summing up equations (195) and (197) we obtain

$$i\hbar\bar{\psi}g^{\nu\mu}\gamma_\mu\partial_\nu\gamma^\mu\psi = 4mc\bar{\psi}\gamma^\mu\psi \quad (198)$$

where $g^{\nu\mu}$ is the metric

$$g^{\nu\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (199)$$

Therefore, we obtain the fermionic mass operator (of the *masson*)

$$m = \frac{i}{4c} \hbar g^{\nu\mu} \gamma_\mu \partial_\nu \quad (200)$$

and the mass current

$$j^\mu = \frac{i\hbar}{4} \bar{\psi} g^{\nu\mu} \gamma_\mu \partial_\nu \gamma^\mu \psi = \frac{i\hbar}{4} \bar{\psi} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \gamma_\mu \gamma^\mu \psi = i\hbar \bar{\psi} g^{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \psi. \quad (201)$$

These two equations clearly show that the *masson* mass depends on the metric. In curved space-time we can always choose a small region where space-time is approximately flat. Hence, we can extend the meaning of $g^{\nu\mu}$ to include curved space-time. Doing this we notice that since the *masson* mass depends on the metric it can not be unique, that is, it has different values in different curved space-times. Since flat space time is a local approximation of curved space-time its mass has only a local meaning. Therefore, we stumbled into another obstacle in quantizing gravity. We can do this formally. Let us take an orthogonal metric, that is a metric in which $g^{\nu\mu} = 0$, for $\nu \neq \mu$. We have then the metric

$$g^{\nu\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} g_{00} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & g_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (202)$$

If we are in a very small region of curved space-time (without large curvature) we can say that $g_{00} \approx 1 + f_{00}$, $g_{11} \approx -1 + f_{11}$, $g_{22} \approx -1 + f_{22}$ and $g_{33} \approx -1 + f_{33}$, and we have for small f_{jj}

$$\delta m = \frac{i}{4c} \hbar \Delta^{\nu\mu} \gamma_\mu \partial_\nu \quad (203)$$

with

$$\Delta^{\nu\mu} = \begin{pmatrix} f_{00} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & f_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

where δm is non-Euclidean. This is the mass acquired by the masson directly from curvature.

We arrive at a quite strong and disturbing conclusion which is: if the associated fermion of the gravitational field does not exist then gravitons do not exist either in ordinary matter since bosons make the interaction between fermions. And this leads us to say that the gravitational field is not propagated at all in ordinary matter, that is, it is always a static field. This is in line with the null results of gravitational waves.

The only solution to this puzzle is to assume that the primon is also the fermion of the gravitational field but this would mean that gravitational waves and gravitons only exist inside hadrons. There would then exist a connection between the Higgs and the graviton. In this case confinement would be related to the hidden realm of gravity. It is worth noticing that there are models of hadrons that consider that quarks do not have definite masses and that is why there is the concept of constituent mass. Also, let us refresh our minds at this point and recall that we had to resort to a special way (via Higgs bosons) for creating the masses of quarks and let us also remember that leptons and primons appear to have inherent masses. The special recourse shows us that mass is created from within, hidden by confinement, that is, hidden from the ordinary world. This is in line, actually, with having an initial mass for the Universe, which reveals that the initial mass as well as the initial space were not created at all. And a final reminder is more than appropriate: the confined world is also the world of fractional charge which is in line with what we found before. As was shown before the masses of quarks are connected to their charges and to the Higgs bosons. And a last point is also important: the confined world inside nucleons is also the world where spin has strange properties. We now see that all this is interconnected and begins to be disentangled.

Therefore, it looks like that gravitational waves (with quanta) in ordinary matter are impossible and may only be possible inside hadrons (or in neutron stars).

Some critics may say that Dirac equation cannot be applied at all in this case. And I say that it has to be applied in the present Universe since it has been proven to be *flat* and if it is flat it obeys Minkowski space. Of course Dirac equation cannot be applied in the Planck scale, but as we deduce from this work the Planck scale never happened.

References

1. C.W. Misner, K.S. Thorne and J.A. Wheeler, in *Gravitation*, W.H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1973, p. 446.

8 Properties of the Galactic Structured State

8.1 The Superweak Force and Its Connection to Neutrinos

From Noether's theorem¹ it follows that any fundamental force is linked to a conservation law. That is why Fischbach proposed the fifth force based on baryon number conservation. According to Fischbach the Eötvös experiment presented some discrepancies that could be eliminated by supposing the existence of a composition dependent force.

The potential energy of such hypothetical force is usually represented by a Yukawa potential which, when added to the standard Newtonian potential energy, becomes²

$$V(r) = -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{r} (1 + \alpha \exp(-r/\lambda)), \quad (204)$$

where α is the new coupling in units of gravity and λ is its range. The dependence on composition can be made explicit by writing $\alpha = q_i q_j \zeta$ with

$$q_i = \cos\theta(N + Z)_i/\mu_i + \sin\theta(N - Z)_i/\mu_i, \quad (205)$$

where the new effective charge has been written as a linear combination of the baryon number and the nuclear isospin per atomic mass unit, and ζ is the coupling constant in terms of G .

Until now most experimental results have not confirmed the existence of this force³, although they do not rule it out because its coupling constant(s) may be

smaller than previously thought. Adelberger et al.³ have found the upper limit of 10^{-13}ms^{-2} in the acceleration which means that the fifth force is at least 10^{10} smaller than the gravitational force. Of course, this force may only exist if there is a violation in the weak equivalence principle, which has been proven to hold³ to a precision of one part in 10^{12} . But it may be violated if the precision is improved. They may, then, reveal the existence of the fifth force.

The superweak force proposed in this work has the same character of that of the fifth force, but has an infinite range. This means that the mass of the mediating boson is zero. From the above expression for the fifth force potential energy we may express the potential energy of the superweak force in terms of the baryon numbers and isospins of two very large bodies i and j as

$$V(r, N, Z) = \pm (A_B(N + Z)_i + A_I(N - Z)_i) \times (A_B(N + Z)_j + A_I(N - Z)_j) \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r} \quad (206)$$

where A_B and A_I are constants and \mathcal{G}_{NN} is the coupling constant. The charge $Q = \mathcal{G}_{NN}[A_B(N + Z) + A_I(N - Z)]$ poses a problem because mass is proportional to its first term $\mathcal{G}_{NN}A_B(N + Z)$. Let us take a look if the second term is good enough for the intended purpose. First let us absorb the constant A_I into \mathcal{G}_{NN} and write $Q = \mathcal{G}_{NN}(N - Z) = \mathcal{G}_{NN}(2N - B)$. Take a volume of space where radioactive decay happens in a certain body which has initially N_1 neutrons, and B neutrons and protons. At a later time the body will have N_2 neutrons and still B neutrons and protons. Therefore, baryon number is conserved but isospin, of course, is not. The difference $N_1 - N_2 = n_e = n_{\nu_e}$. Hence we can say that such decay generates a neutrino current given by

$$j_{SW,NN} = \mathcal{G}_{NN} \bar{\psi} \gamma^5 \Phi_N \psi \quad (207)$$

as was seen in section 7.1. The smallest superweak charge is thus

$$Q_{SW} = \mathcal{G}_{NN} \quad (208)$$

and means that besides carrying a lepton number the neutrino carries a superweak charge. And since it carries a charge it probably has a mass. This neutrino picture casts doubt on the existence of Majorana neutrinos.

The superweak potential energy between two bodies can then be described as

$$V_{ij}(r_{ij}, N_i, Z_j) = \pm (N - Z)_i \times (N - Z)_j \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}}. \quad (209)$$

Let us make the ± 1 equal to a constant b . Then

$$V_{ij}(r_{ij}, N_i, Z_j) = b(N - Z)_i \times (N - Z)_j \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}}. \quad (210)$$

The energy of the galaxies of the whole Universe is thus given by

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^N (K_i) + \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N V_{ij}^G + \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N V_{ij}^{SW} \quad (211)$$

where V_{ij}^G and V_{ij}^{SW} are the gravitational and superweak potential energies of the pair ij . We can write

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} m_i v_i^2 - \sum_{i,j(i>j)}^N m_i \times m_j (\sqrt{G})^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}} + b \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N (2N - B)_i \times (2N - B)_j \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \quad (212)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{2} m_i v_i^2 - \sum_{i,j(i>j)}^N m_i \times m_j (\sqrt{G})^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}} + b B_i B_j \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N (2\eta_i - 1) \times (2\eta_j - 1) \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \quad (213)$$

subject to the condition

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^N B_i = \text{constant}. \quad (214)$$

It is important to notice that the number of neutrons and protons vary from galaxy to galaxy for a given time (measured since the Big Bang). This means that the superweak field among galaxies is not homogeneous. The two potentials together produce an effective potential, $V(r)$,

$$V(r) = - \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N m_i \times m_j (\sqrt{G})^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}} + b \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N B_i B_j (2\eta_i - 1) \times (2\eta_j - 1) \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \quad (215)$$

which is responsible for the spatial configuration of galaxies into bubbles and sheets. Since $m = B m_p$ we have

$$V(r) = - \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N \left(\frac{B_i B_j}{r_{ij}} \right) \left[(m_p \sqrt{G})^2 - b (2\eta_i - 1) \times (2\eta_j - 1) \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \right]. \quad (216)$$

If we choose $b = -1$ we obtain

$$V(r) = - \sum_{i=1, i>j}^N \left(\frac{B_i B_j}{r_{ij}} \right) \left[\left(m_p \sqrt{G} \right)^2 + (2\eta_i - 1) \times (2\eta_j - 1) \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \right] \quad (217)$$

which accounts for the acceleration of galaxies simply because the product $(2\eta_i - 1) \times (2\eta_j - 1)$ increases as the galaxy moves towards the wall since the number of neutrons increases with time. The choice $b = 1$ suggests that the superweak force should be, actually, an attractive force. Hence its potential energy is

$$V_{ij}(r_{ij}, N_i, Z_j) = -(N - Z)_i \times (N - Z)_j \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_{ij}}. \quad (218)$$

In the beginning of the Universe $N_i \approx N_j \approx N_0$; $Z_i \approx Z_j \approx Z_0$; $r_{ij} \approx r_0$. We obtain then


$$\begin{aligned} V_{ij}^0(r_0, N_0, Z_0) &= -(N - Z)_0 \times (N - Z)_0 \mathcal{G}_{NN}^2 \frac{1}{r_0} \propto \\ -g_{SF}^2 \frac{\exp(-\mu_{SF} r_0)}{r_0} &\sim -g_{SF}^2 \frac{1}{r_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (219)$$

for $\mu_{SF} r_0 \ll 1$, that is, the superweak force is unified to the strong force in the beginning of the Universe. This is a preliminary unification and a more profound (in terms of field theory) is needed.

8.2 The Galactic Medium is a Strange ‘Metal of Clusters of Galaxies and Neutrinos’

Since the ‘beginning’ of the universe, after the formation of primordial stars, the number of neutrons, N , has increased at the expense of the number of protons which has decreased. This increase in N takes place in the cores of stars by means of the fusion process that happens in the whole Universe. As the Universe ages stars become white dwarfs, brown dwarfs and neutron stars. During the aging process the core density of a star increases and the high electron Fermi energy drives electron capture onto nuclei and free protons. This last process, called neutronization, happens via the weak interaction. The most significant neutronization reactions⁴ are:

- Electron capture by nuclei,



- Electron capture by free protons,



where W means that both reactions proceed via charged currents of the electroweak interaction.

Of course, neutronization takes place in the stars of all galaxies, and thus, the number of neutrons increases relative to the number of protons as the universe ages. For example, a white dwarf in the slow cooling stage (for $T \leq 10^7 \text{K}$) reaches a steady proton to neutron density of about 1/8, and takes about 10^9 years to cool off completely, which is a time close to the present age of the universe. By then, most stars have become white dwarfs (or neutron stars). This steady increase is expected to be very slow.

Therefore we can say that galaxies release neutrinos and doing so increase their superweak charge deficits. Making the analogy with the electric charge we can say that galaxies are *superweak ions*, that is, they have a neutrino deficit. And neutrinos in the Universe are like electrons in a metal, they are almost free and abundant. On the other hand observations have shown that the medium formed by galaxies has quite a large degree of order since voids have an average size of about $40h-1 \text{Mpc}^5$. Therefore we can say that the Universe is a sort of metal of clusters of galaxies in which neutrinos are the conductors.

8.3 Properties of the Neutrino Gas of the Universe

Neutronization is a very slow process. Less than 10% of hydrogen has been converted to helium. We also know that there is today only one atom of helium for every 10 atoms of hydrogen. Since the total number of baryons of the Universe is approximately 10^{69} , there are, therefore, at least about 10^{68} neutrinos wandering about in the Universe. As we will see the neutrino density is much larger. We can say, then, that the Universe is approximately an ideal neutrino gas. Taking into account the present radius of the Universe ($\sim 3 \times 10^{27} \text{cm}$) the lower bound for the neutrino density is about 10^{-14} neutrinos/ cm^3 . The neutrino current (or superweak current) is, then,

$$j_\nu = n_\nu c \mathcal{G}_{NN}. \quad (222)$$

Let us first consider free neutrinos. In this case their energies are

$$E(k) = c\hbar k = |\vec{p}|c = c\hbar\sqrt{k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2}. \quad (223)$$

Using Born-von Karman boundary conditions the wave function solution for stationary states is

$$\Psi_k(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{1}{V} \exp i(\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r} - \omega t) \quad (224)$$

where $k_x = \frac{2\pi n_x}{L}$, $k_y = \frac{2\pi n_y}{L}$, $k_z = \frac{2\pi n_z}{L}$ (n_x, n_y, n_z integers). Therefore, a region of k-space of volume Ω contains $\frac{\Omega L^3}{8\pi^3}$ allowed values of \vec{k} . Let us have in mind that in our case we are dealing only with the neutrino ν_e , that is, we are dealing with only one helicity. The neutrino density of neutrinos with \vec{k} within the Fermi sphere is therefore

$$n_F^\nu = \frac{4\pi k_F^3}{3} \frac{1}{8\pi^3} = \frac{k_F^3}{6\pi^2}. \quad (225)$$

Since the agglomerates are separated by about 50Mpc for the present Universe we should have $\lambda_F \sim 2\pi/k_F \sim 50Mpc \sim 10^{24}m$ and then $n_F^\nu \sim 10^{-78}$ neutrinos/cm³. We also obtain $E_F \sim 10^{-49}J \approx 10^{-30}eV$. Such a small energy only makes sense for massless (or almost massless) particles. In the beginning of the Universe λ_F was much smaller and E_F was then much larger. This means that in the beginning more neutrinos were below the Fermi level. We can thus say that k_i (or L) depends on the red shift.

The energy levels of a neutrino confined in a box with sides equal to L are given by

$$E = c\hbar\sqrt{k_x^2 + k_y^2 + k_z^2} = \frac{2\pi c\hbar}{L} \sqrt{n_x^2 + n_y^2 + n_z^2}. \quad (226)$$

The number of energy levels $N(E)$ per unit volume with energies between zero and E is

$$N(E) = \frac{1}{8} \left(\frac{4}{3}\pi k^3 \right) = \frac{4\pi^4}{3h^3 c^3} E^3. \quad (227)$$

This expression has also been calculated by Kubo⁶ in a different way. Therefore, the neutrino density of levels at the Fermi energy is

$$g(E_F) = \frac{4\pi^4}{h^3 c^3} E_F^2. \quad (228)$$

As E_F is very small almost all neutrinos produced in stars attain states above the Fermi energy. Therefore, most neutrinos in the Universe are conductors of the superweak charge.

8.4 Neutrino Levels in a Weak Periodic Potential

In the beginning of this section we will follow the footsteps of Ashcroft & Mermin⁷ (but we also could follow chapter 3 of Ziman⁸) on electron levels in solids. Before considering the neutrinos that wander about in the Universe let us consider the general problem of neutrinos subject to a periodic potential

$$U(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}) = U(\mathbf{r}) \quad (229)$$

where \mathbf{R} is a Bravais lattice vector that we assume to exist. For the Universe \mathbf{R} depends on the redshift, that is, it depends on the age of the Universe. In the young Universe, for example, \mathbf{R} was small. In the present Universe (or local Universe) it is of the order of the distance between agglomerates. The potential $U(\mathbf{r})$ is an effective potential which should be the result of the gravitational and superweak fields and its mathematical expression may be very complicated. We can consider that the effective field is weak so that we can disregard pair creation. We can also disregard the interaction of neutrinos with each other, that is, we can use an independent neutrino approximation. Since we are dealing with massless neutrinos they should satisfy Dirac equation

$$(-i\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} + U(\mathbf{r})) \Psi = i\hbar \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t}. \quad (230)$$

For stationary solutions we have

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}, t) = \psi(\mathbf{r}) \exp(-i \frac{Et}{\hbar}) \quad (231)$$

and

$$(-i\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} + U(\mathbf{r})) \psi(\mathbf{r}) = E\psi(\mathbf{r}). \quad (232)$$

We can also assume that Bloch's theorem is valid for neutrinos and we can thus consider that Ψ is a plane wave times a function of the Bravais lattice,

$$\Psi(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r})u(\mathbf{r}) \quad (233)$$

where

$$u(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}) = u(\mathbf{r}) \quad (234)$$

and thus

$$\psi(\mathbf{r} + \mathbf{R}) = \exp(i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{R})\psi(\mathbf{r}). \quad (235)$$

Bloch's theorem is valid for neutrinos simply because Floquet's theorem⁹ can also be applied to Dirac's equation.

Now we expand $\psi(\mathbf{r})$ as

$$\psi(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{q}} c_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \quad (236)$$

and

$$U(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\mathbf{K}} U_{\mathbf{K}} e^{i\mathbf{K}\cdot\mathbf{r}}. \quad (237)$$

The coefficients $U_{\mathbf{K}}$ are given by

$$U_{\mathbf{K}} = \frac{1}{V} \int_{cell} d\mathbf{r} U(\mathbf{r}) e^{-i\mathbf{K}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \quad (238)$$

and satisfy the condition $U_{-\mathbf{K}} = U_{\mathbf{K}}^*$. By changing the reference level for the potential energy we can make

$$U_0 = \frac{1}{V} \int_{cell} d\mathbf{r} U(\mathbf{r}) = 0. \quad (239)$$

Assuming symmetry inversion and making $U(\mathbf{r}) = U(-\mathbf{r})$ we have

$$U_{-\mathbf{K}} = U_{\mathbf{K}} = U_{\mathbf{K}}^* \quad (240)$$

Placing the corresponding expansions into Dirac equation we find

$$\sum_{\mathbf{q}} e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \left[(c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{q} - E) c_{\mathbf{q}} + \sum_{\mathbf{K}'} U_{\mathbf{K}'} c_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{K}'} \right] = 0 \quad (241)$$

and since the plane waves form an orthogonal set we obtain

$$(c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{q} - E) c_{\mathbf{q}} + \sum_{\mathbf{K}'} U_{\mathbf{K}'} c_{\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{K}'} = 0. \quad (242)$$

Writing \mathbf{q} in the form $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{K}$ so that \mathbf{K} is a reciprocal lattice vector chosen so that \mathbf{k} lies in the first brillouin zone we can write

$$(c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{K}) - E) c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K}} + \sum_{\mathbf{K}'} U_{\mathbf{K}'} c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K}-\mathbf{K}'} = 0 \quad (243)$$

and making the change of variables $\mathbf{K}' \rightarrow \mathbf{K}' - \mathbf{K}$ we finally obtain

$$(c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{K}) - E) c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K}} + \sum_{\mathbf{K}'} U_{\mathbf{K}'-\mathbf{K}} c_{\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{K}'} = 0. \quad (244)$$

The neutrino energy bands are revealed in a better way if we look for all solutions to the Dirac equation that have the form $\Psi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r})$. Doing this we find

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathbf{k}} \exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) &= \\ (-i\hbar c\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\nabla + U(\mathbf{r})) \exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) &= \\ \exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}) [c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot(-i\nabla + \mathbf{k}) + U(\mathbf{r})] u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) &= E_{\mathbf{k}} \exp(i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r})u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) \end{aligned} \quad (245)$$

and

$$H_{\mathbf{k}}u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = (-i\hbar c\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\nabla + U(\mathbf{r})) u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = E_{\mathbf{k}}u_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) \quad (246)$$

which shows that we can find $E_{\mathbf{k}}$ solving this eigenvalue problem. Of course, there is an infinite family of solutions with discretely spaced eigenvalues, which are labeled by the band index n , that is, we have to write $E_{\mathbf{k}} = E_n(\mathbf{k})$. Hence, for each n there is a set of levels specified by $E_n(\mathbf{k})$, called an energy band.

From Davydov¹⁰ we find that the mean velocity (effective velocity) of ν_e is

$$\mathbf{v}_m = \frac{c^2}{E} \int d\mathbf{r} \psi_{n\mathbf{k}}^*(\mathbf{r}) \mathbf{p} \psi_{n\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}) = \quad (247)$$

which may be smaller than c and shows that the interaction of the electron neutrino with the galactic lattice lowers its effective velocity, and thus, makes the neutrino to acquire an *effective mass*.

Neutrinos in the Universe are mainly produced in the cores of stars during the process of fusion or during the creation of novae and supernovae. These neutrinos have energies much larger than the Fermi energy, and therefore, most neutrinos of the Universe are not in the ground state. This means that as the Universe ages it becomes a better neutrino conductor.

Let us follow the calculations of Ashcroft & Mermin¹¹ from page 152 to 160, modified for the case of neutrinos. As is shown on p. 158, for \mathbf{q} vectors on a Bragg plane

$$E = E_{\mathbf{q}}^0 \pm |U_{\mathbf{K}}| = c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha}\cdot\mathbf{q} \pm |U_{\mathbf{K}}|. \quad (248)$$

Since the interacting lattice potential is small the second term above is small. That is, the band gap is small. Since the \mathbf{K} vectors depend on the lattice,

and the lattice depends on the expansion of the Universe, we can say that \mathbf{K} depends on the redshift and as a consequence E depends on the redshift, Z . As we go to higher redshifts the \mathbf{K} vectors increase, and thus the band gaps increase too. Therefore, the band gap is not unique. For the present Universe (local Universe), since \mathbf{q} is much larger than \mathbf{K} there is an incredible number of repeated zones. Taking into account the redshift dependence we should write

$$E(\mathbf{q}, Z) = c\hbar\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cdot \mathbf{q} \pm |U_{\mathbf{K}}(Z)|. \quad (249)$$

In the beginning of the Universe the number of neutrinos was much smaller than it is today and also the density was very high so that neutrinos were not transparent. Therefore, in the beginning the Universe was a poor neutrino conductor. As it aged it became a better conductor.

In the Universe the periodicity is not exact, that is, there is an *average* distance between any two cluster which is about 50 Mpc . That is, the lattice is not that of a crystalline solid. This means that we can only define an average reciprocal lattice vector, \mathbf{K} , and then we may not have forbidden bands but just bands having a smaller number of neutrinos. But since most neutrinos in the Universe are very energetic their \mathbf{k} vectors are much larger than the average reciprocal lattice vector. That is, the Universe is a very good neutrino conductor. It is quite important therefore to determine the crystallographic parameters of the Universe, that is, the approximate direct lattice and the inverse lattice, as well.

The superweak force between pairs of galaxies depend on the number of neutrinos that are exchanged between them, that is, depend on their superweak charges. As we see it is an unsurmountable problem. Please, see calculation below for neutrino bands in one dimension.

8.4.1 Neutrino Energy Bands in One Dimension

Splitting up Dirac equation into two pairs we can write for the neutrino

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_a \\ \psi_b \end{pmatrix} \quad (250)$$

where $\psi_b = \lambda\psi_a$ ($\lambda = \pm 1$). The wavefunction satisfies the equation

$$\left[s_3 \partial_3 - \lambda i \frac{E - V(z)}{\hbar c} \right] \psi_a = 0 \quad (251)$$

Using a wavefunction propagating in the z direction we have

$$\psi_a(z) = C e^{ikz} u_k(z) = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} e^{ikz} u_k(z) \quad (252)$$

and we obtain therefore

$$\frac{\hbar}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \frac{du_k}{dz} + i\frac{\hbar}{2}ku_k \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} = \lambda i \frac{E - V(z)}{\hbar c} \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} u_k, \quad (253)$$

that is, the two equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\hbar}{2} \frac{du_k}{dz} a + i\frac{\hbar}{2}ku_k a &= \lambda i \frac{E - V(z)}{\hbar c} u_k a \\ -\frac{\hbar}{2} \frac{du_k}{dz} b - i\frac{\hbar}{2}ku_k b &= \lambda i \frac{E - V(z)}{\hbar c} u_k b. \end{aligned} \quad (254)$$

from which we get $ab = 0$, that is, either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. The pair of equations above shows that the solution $a = 1, b = 0, \lambda = \hbar/2$ (neutrinos) is equivalent to the solution $b = 1, a = 0, \lambda = -\hbar/2$ (antineutrinos), so that the two helicity states continue being possible and with definite values. That is, we can write

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } \lambda = \hbar/2 \quad (255)$$

and

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } \lambda = -\hbar/2. \quad (256)$$

Making $b = 0$, that is, dealing with neutrinos, we are left with only the first equation

$$\frac{du_k}{dz} + ik u_k = i \frac{E - V(z)}{\hbar c} u_k \quad (257)$$

which can be easily solved (it is a particular case of Bernoulli's equation) depending on the form of $V(z)$. For example, for a periodic potential of the form $V(z) = V_0 \cos Kz$, we have

$$\frac{du_k}{dz} = i \left(\frac{E}{\hbar c} - k - \frac{V_0}{\hbar c} \cos Kz \right) u_k \quad (258)$$

whose solution is

$$u_k(z) = u_0 e^{i\left(\frac{E}{\hbar c} - k\right)z} e^{-i\frac{V_0}{\hbar c} \sin Kz}. \quad (259)$$

Let us consider now that K is a reciprocal lattice vector, that is, $Ka = 2n\pi$, and let us find the condition that satisfies the relation

$$u_k(z + a) = u_k(z). \quad (260)$$

It is satisfied if

$$\left(k - \frac{E}{\hbar c}\right) a = 2l\pi, l = \text{integer} \quad (261)$$

that is, we find

$$k(l) = \frac{E}{\hbar c} + 2l\pi, \quad (262)$$

clearly showing the existence of neutrino energy bands. The wavefunction $\Psi(z, t)$ is

$$\Psi_l(z, t) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} u_0 e^{i[k(l)z - \frac{E}{\hbar}t]} e^{-i\frac{V_0}{\hbar c} \sin Kz}.$$

What we developed above can be applied to any (well-behaved potential) because we can always express any function $V(z)$ in terms of a Fourier series and, therefore, the general solution is always of the form

$$u_k(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} u_0 e^{i[k(l)z - \frac{E}{\hbar}t]} \exp\left(-i\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j \sin(K_j z + \phi)\right). \quad (263)$$

If neutrinos have a very small mass, then we can just use the well-known theory of electron bands having in mind that there is always a factor of 2 which should be dropped because in the case of neutrinos we have either one helicity state or the other one(neutrino or antineutrino) and in the case of electrons the spin states do not mean particle and antiparticle.

References


1. E. Noether, in *Nach. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen*, 171, 1918.
2. E. Fischbach, in *Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on Gravitational Measurements, Fundamental Metrology and Constants, 1987*, ed. by V. de Sabbata and V. N. Melnikov(D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, 1988).
3. E. G. Adelberger, B. R. Heckel, C. W. Stubbs and W. F. Rogers, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **41**, 269(1991).
4. S.L. Shapiro and S.A. Teukolsky, in *Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars*, John Wiley & Sons, New York(1983), p. 521.

5. H. El-Ad, T. Piran, and L.N. da Costa, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **287**, 790 (1997).
6. R. Kubo, in *Statistical Physics*, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam(1965), p. 288.
7. N.W. Ashcroft and N.D. Mermin, in *Solid State Physics*, Saunders College, Philadelphia(1976), pp. 132-141.
8. J.M. Ziman, in *Principles of the Theory of Solids*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1972, pp. 77-112.
9. S. Flügge, in *Practical Quantum Mechanics*, Vol. I, Springer-Verlag, New York, USA, 1974, p. 62.
10. A.S. Davydov, in *Quantum Mechanics*, 2nd ed., Pergamon Press, Oxford(1965).
11. N.W. Ashcroft and N.D. Mermin, in *Solid State Physics*, Saunders College, Philadelphia(1976), pp. 152-160.

9 Another Solution to the Solar Neutrino Problem

9.1 The Solar Neutrino Problem and Its Current Solution

Electron neutrinos are copiously produced in the interiors of stars. In the Sun they are produced in the pp cycle which dominates the fusion process in cool stars



This process generates a certain neutrino flux Φ_E that would be expected to be detected at the Earth. The data of super-Kamiokande^{1,2} show that only about half of the predicted flux Φ_E is actually detected. This constitutes the solar neutrino problem. There are three main solutions to the problem without changing the standard solar model: a) Vacuum Neutrino Oscillations; b) Resonant Matter Neutrino Oscillations; and c) Neutrino with Magnetic Moment.

The first solution requires a quite large vacuum mixing angle which appears to be unreal. The third solution is not very reasonable because according to it the neutrino flux would depend on the solar activity related to sun spots, but Kamiokande experiments have ruled out such dependence. Therefore, only the second solution remains reasonable and that is why it is the most acceptable solution. It considers that in their journey towards the Earth electron neutrinos are transformed into ν_μ and ν_τ . Of course, it is only possible if ν_e has a mass

diferent from zero. The main drawback is the following: *the other leptons are not transformed into each other, except in decaying processes.* And an important question should be asked about this: why not having the opposite, the transformation of ν_μ and ν_τ into ν_e ? Another important drawback is that if neutrinos have nonzero masses we expect that the masses of ν_μ and ν_τ are larger than that of ν_e . How can a less massive particle be transformed into a more massive particle without the action of a third particle? Let us recall that the only transformation that we know is that of K^0 and $\overline{K^0}$ into each other via an intermediate $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair. First of all it is not a transformation between fermions, it is actually, a transformation between quarks due to a CP transformation. In the case of neutrinos which pair of particles could be the agent of the transformation since neutrinos are not composed of other particles?

The recent data of SNO³ has reduced the MSW oscillation solution to only the Large Mixing Angle (LMA) solution according to the SNO Collaboration itself, to Bahcall et al.⁴ and other researchers. But taking into account the data of SN1987A, Kachelriess et al.⁵ restricts also the use of LMA-MSW saying that “On the other hand the LMA-MSW solution can easily survive as the best overall solution, although its size is generally reduced when compared to fits to the solar data only”.

9.2 Another Solution to the Solar Neutrino Problem

As we saw in chapter 8 neutrinos are the charge carriers of the superweak charge. Therefore, we can say that the solar model should be modified and should take into account the superweak interaction. By means of it neutrinos could interact with baryons and scatter inelastically off electrons and muons before leaving the star. In this way the neutrino transparency in a star would be reduced, that is, the neutrino flux would be reduced. At this point it is quite hard to work out some numbers because we are in the dark but we can say that the overall transparency should be substantially reduced. Modifying what was developed by Shapiro and Teukolsky⁶ we can say that the effective mean free path, should be

$$\lambda_{eff} = (\lambda_e \lambda_n \lambda_N)^{1/3} \quad (264)$$

where λ_e is the neutrino mean free path due to the cross section in $\nu_e - e^-$ scattering, λ_n is the neutrino mean free path due to $n - \nu_e$ (caused by the weak interaction) scattering and λ_N is the neutrino mean free path caused by the superweak current due to the presence of nucleons. We expect that λ_N is

smaller than λ_e or λ_n in order to diminish the neutrino transparency. If we write

$$\lambda_N = \frac{1}{\sigma_N n_N} \quad (265)$$

where σ_N is the cross section due to the superweak interaction and n_N is the nucleon density. Of course λ_N should be a function of $\frac{\rho_{nuc}}{\rho}$ and of $\frac{1}{E_\nu}$. That is,

we expect to have a law of the form

$$\lambda_N = C_1 \left(\frac{\rho_{nuc}}{\rho} \right)^q \left(\frac{C_2}{E_\nu} \right)^r, \quad (266)$$

that is, a law similar in form to λ_e and λ_n . The constants can be inferred from the experimental data and from solar models because a closed theory on this new interaction will take a long time, of course. The above equation means that a part of the neutrino cross section measured on Earth has to be attributed to the superweak interaction. With more neutrino data we should be able to measure it.

As is discussed above we should have $\lambda_N = \frac{1}{\sigma_N n_N} < (\lambda_e \lambda_n)^{1/2}$. On the other hand for $\rho \lesssim 2\rho_{nuc}$, $n_N \approx n_p = 9.6 \times 10^{35} \left(\frac{\rho_{nuc}}{\rho} \right)^2 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and hence we obtain⁷

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_N} < 1.92 \times 10^{38} \left(\frac{\rho_{nuc}}{\rho} \right)^{19/6} \left(\frac{10^5 \text{ eV}}{E_\nu} \right) m^{-2}. \quad (267)$$

For B neutrinos $E = 14 \text{ MeV}$ and ρ in the core of the Sun is about 100 g/cm^3 and hence we have

$$\sigma_N > 1.5 \times 10^{-74} \text{ cm}^2 \quad (268)$$

whose lower bound is extremely small. In the calculation above we used $\rho_{nuc} = 2.8 \times 10^{14} \text{ g/cm}^3$.

We can have a better estimate making the following considerations. In order to lower substantially the neutrino flux we should have $\lambda_{eff} \sim R_c \approx 0.25 R_S = 1.7 \times 10^5 \text{ km}$ (R_c is the core radius of the Sun) and thus we obtain $\lambda_e \lambda_n \lambda_N = \lambda_{eff}^3 \approx 4.9 \times 10^{24} \text{ m}^3$. As $(\lambda_e \lambda_n)^{1/2} = 2 \times 10^5 \text{ km} \left(\frac{\rho_{nuc}}{\rho} \right)^{7/6} \left(\frac{10^5 \text{ eV}}{E_\nu} \right)^{2.5}$ (ref. 6 above) we get

$$\sigma_N = 2 \times 10^{-63} \text{ cm}^2 \quad (269)$$

which is quite small. Just for comparison let us recall that weak processes (inverse β -decay) have cross sections of the order of 10^{-43} cm^2 (ref. 8).

References

- 1) S. Fukuda et al., hep-ex/0103032.
- 2) S. Fukuda et al., hep-ex/0103033.
- 3) SNO Collaboration, nucl-ex/0204009; Phys. Rev. Lett. 89 (2002), 011302
- 4) J.N. Bahcall, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, C. Peña-Garay, CERN-TH/2002-094, IFIC-02-18.

- 5) M. Kachelriess, A. Strumia, R. Tomas, J.W.F. Valle, Phys.Rev. D65 (2002) 073016.
- 6) S.L. Shapiro and S.A. Teukolsky, in Black Holes, White Dwarfs and Neutron Stars, John Wiley & Sons, New York(1983), pp. 326, 327.
- 7) Idem, p 310.
- 8) D.H. Perkins, Introduction to High Energy Physics, 3rd ed., Addison-Wesley, Menlo Park, California, 1987, p. 213.

10 Some Topics in Nuclear Physics

10.1 The Nuclear Potential and the Stability of the Deuteron, Triton and Alpha Particle

The most accurate empirical nuclear potential to date is the Paris potential¹. It has two expressions: one for the antisymmetric states(with respect to spin), allowed for two protons, two neutrons, as well as a proton and a neutron, and one for the symmetric states(with respect to spin), accessible only for the n-p system. In any case, when $S = 0$, there is only a central potential between any two nucleons(V_{C0}). The Paris group has found that the potential has four different terms and is described by ^{1,2}

$$V(r) = V_{C1}(r) + V_T(r)\Omega_T + V_{S0}(r)\Omega_{S0} + V_{S02}(r)\Omega_{S02} \quad (270)$$

where

$$\Omega_T = 3 \frac{(\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{r})(\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{r})}{r^2} - \vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2, \quad (271)$$

$$\hbar\Omega_{S0} = (\vec{\sigma}_1 + \vec{\sigma}_2) \cdot \vec{L}, \quad (272)$$

$$\hbar^2\Omega_{S02} = (\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{L})(\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{L}) + (\vec{\sigma}_2 \cdot \vec{L})(\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{L}). \quad (273)$$

In these equations \vec{L} is the total orbital angular momentum of the nucleons, $\hbar/2\sigma$ is the spin operator of each nucleon, the subscripts 1 and 2 in σ refer to

the two nucleons, and the subscript 1 in the first term refers to $S = 1$ (it is V_{C0} for $S=0$). The first three terms are responsible for binding the deuteron. The term $V_T(r)$ is associated also with the large electric quadrupole moment of the deuteron². We clearly see that the spatial part of the wavefunction must be antisymmetric. Of course, the spin wavefunctions $|S, S_z \rangle (|1, -1 \rangle, |1, 0 \rangle$ and $|1, 1 \rangle)$ are symmetric under particle exchange. The different terms of the potential are presented in Fig. 10.1.

According to the ideas above discussed there is more repulsion for $S = 0$ because in this case more vectorial mesons(colorless) are exchanged. Let us verify this. In Fig. 10.2, which is for $S = 0$ we should consider the scalar mesons which are exchanged between the two primons of each pair below (each primon belongs to a different nucleon): $\downarrow p_3^\gamma p_1^\gamma \downarrow, \downarrow p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma \downarrow, \downarrow p_2^\beta p_2^\beta \downarrow, \uparrow p_2^\beta p_2^\beta \uparrow, \uparrow p_3^\alpha p_3^\alpha \uparrow, \uparrow p_3^\alpha p_2^\alpha \uparrow$. The corresponding $q\bar{q}$'s exchanged are: 01 $d\bar{u}$, 01 $u\bar{d}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, 01 $t\bar{b}$, 02 $u\bar{u}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $t\bar{t}$, 04 $u\bar{u}$, 04 $d\bar{d}$, 04 $s\bar{s}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $d\bar{d}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$, 01 $u\bar{c}$, 01 $c\bar{u}$, 01 $s\bar{b}$, and 01 $b\bar{s}$. This means that the following scalar mesons are exchanged: 01 π^+ , 01 π^- , 02 π^0 , 04 η , 04 η_c , 01 D^0 , 01 \bar{D}^0 , 01 B_s^0 , 01 \bar{B}_s^0 , 01 $b\bar{t}$, 01 $t\bar{b}$, 02 $t\bar{t}$, and 02 $b\bar{b}$. Then, there are 22 attractive terms. This, of course, is for a certain configuration of the supercolors of the two nucleons. In other configurations we can also have scalar mesons exchanged between the two primons $\downarrow p_1^j p_2^j \downarrow$. They are, respectively, the $q\bar{q}$'s: $d\bar{c}$, $c\bar{d}$, $s\bar{t}$, and $t\bar{s}$. Then, for other configurations there can also exist the exchange of the scalar mesons: D^+ , D^- , $s\bar{t}$, and $t\bar{s}$.

Let us take care now of the vector mesons. They should be exchanged between the primons of the pairs (for the supercolor configuration shown in the figure): $\downarrow p_3^\gamma p_1^\gamma \uparrow, \downarrow p_1^\gamma p_1^\gamma \uparrow, \downarrow p_2^\beta p_2^\beta \uparrow, \uparrow p_2^\beta p_2^\beta \downarrow, \downarrow p_2^\alpha p_2^\alpha \uparrow, \downarrow p_2^\alpha p_3^\alpha \uparrow$. The following $q\bar{q}$'s are exchanged: 01 $d\bar{u}$, 01 $u\bar{d}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, 01 $t\bar{b}$, 02 $u\bar{u}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $t\bar{t}$, 06 $u\bar{u}$, 06 $d\bar{d}$, 06 $s\bar{s}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $d\bar{d}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$, 01 $u\bar{c}$, 01 $c\bar{u}$, 01 $s\bar{b}$, and 01 $b\bar{s}$. Therefore, there are the exchange of the vector mesons: 08 ω (or 08 ρ or both of them), 06 ϕ , 04 J/Ψ , 01 $D^*(2010)^+$, 01 $D^*(2010)^-$, and the vectorial mesons 01 $d\bar{u}$, 01 $u\bar{d}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, 01 $t\bar{b}$, 02 $t\bar{t}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$, 01 $s\bar{b}$, and 01 $b\bar{s}$. There are, then, 30 repulsive terms.

Taking into account the overall effect the repulsion probably overcomes the attraction, and that is why there is no binding for $S = 0$. Although it was done for a certain supercolor configuration this is a general result. That is, for other configurations the number of repulsive (vectorial) terms is always much larger than the number of attractive (scalar) terms. The former is about 1.5 the latter.

Let us now consider $S = 1$. In this case let us take a look at Fig. 10.3. The scalar mesons which are exchanged between the two primons (of different nucleons) of each pair are: $\downarrow p_2^\alpha p_2^\alpha \downarrow, \uparrow p_2^\alpha p_2^\alpha \uparrow, \uparrow p_2^\beta p_2^\beta \uparrow, \uparrow p_1^\beta p_1^\beta \uparrow, \uparrow p_1^\beta p_2^\beta \uparrow, \uparrow p_2^\beta p_1^\beta \uparrow, \uparrow p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma \uparrow, \downarrow p_3^\gamma p_1^\gamma \downarrow$. Thus, the corresponding $q\bar{q}$'s are: 06 $u\bar{u}$, 06 $d\bar{d}$, 06 $s\bar{s}$, 02 $u\bar{u}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $t\bar{t}$, 02 $c\bar{d}$, 02 $d\bar{c}$, 02 $t\bar{s}$, 02 $s\bar{t}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $d\bar{d}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$, 01 $d\bar{u}$, 01 $u\bar{d}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, and 01 $t\bar{b}$. There are, then, the following scalar mesons: 06 η , 02 π^0 , 01 π^+ , 01 π^- , 04 η_c , 02 D^- , 02 D^+ , 02 $t\bar{t}$, 02 $t\bar{s}$, 02 $s\bar{t}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, and 01 $t\bar{b}$.

There are, then, 28 attractive terms. In other supercolor configurations we can also have scalar mesons exchanged between the primons $\downarrow p_2^j p_3^j \downarrow$. They are the $q\bar{q}$'s $u\bar{c}$, $c\bar{u}$, $s\bar{b}$, and $b\bar{s}$. Then, we can have the scalar mesons D^0 , \bar{D}^0 , B_s^0 , and \bar{B}_s^0 . Let us consider now the vector mesons. They should be exchanged between the primons of the pairs: $\downarrow p_2^\alpha p_2^\alpha \uparrow$, $\uparrow p_2^\alpha p_2^\alpha \downarrow$, $\downarrow p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma \uparrow$, $\uparrow p_3^\gamma p_3^\gamma \downarrow$. They are, respectively: 04 $u\bar{u}$, 04 $d\bar{d}$, 04 $s\bar{s}$, 01 $d\bar{u}$, 01 $u\bar{d}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, 01 $t\bar{b}$, 02 $c\bar{c}$, 02 $d\bar{d}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$. There are, then, the following vector mesons: 04 ω (or 04 ρ or both of them), 04 ϕ , 02 J/Ψ , 01 $d\bar{u}$, 01 $u\bar{d}$, 01 $b\bar{t}$, 01 $t\bar{b}$, 02 $d\bar{d}$, 02 $b\bar{b}$. Hence, there are 18 repulsive terms. For other supercolor configurations the number of attractive (scalar) terms is either larger or equal to the number of repulsive terms, and since the scalar mesons have shorter ranges than the vectorial mesons (for the same $q\bar{q}$), there can exist an equilibrium position, and then, the system with $S = 1$ can be stable. In other supercolor configurations we can have vectorial mesons exchanged between the primon pairs $\downarrow p_1^j p_1^j \uparrow$, $\downarrow p_1^j p_2^j \uparrow$, $\downarrow p_2^j p_3^j \uparrow$. They are the $q\bar{q}$'s: $u\bar{u}$, $c\bar{c}$, $t\bar{t}$, $d\bar{c}$, $c\bar{d}$, $s\bar{t}$, $t\bar{s}$, $c\bar{u}$, $u\bar{c}$, $s\bar{b}$, and $b\bar{s}$. Then, we can also have the following vector mesons: $D^*(2007)^0$, $\bar{D}^*(2007)^0$, $D^*(2010)^+$, and $D^*(2010)^-$.

This also shows us the way of analysing the stability of other compound hadrons. It is clear then that the color field is not responsible for binding the deuteron. We have then established the connection between quarks and the exchange of scalar and vector mesons in the nucleons.

Therefore, in the deuteron (that is, for $S = 1$), the most important scalar term is the pionic term, and the most important vectorial term is that involving ω . This means that a quite good approximate nuclear potential energy is

$$V(r) = -g_\pi^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\pi r}}{r} + g_\omega^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\omega r}}{r} \quad (274)$$

which agrees with Walecka's theory of highly condensed matter³. It corresponds to the $V_{C1}(r)$ term of the Paris potential.

An improved potential energy with the first four scalar terms and the first four vectorial terms is

$$\begin{aligned} V(r) = & -g_\pi^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\pi r}}{r} - g_\eta^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\eta r}}{r} - g_D^2 \frac{e^{\mu_D r}}{r} - g_B^2 \frac{e^{\mu_B r}}{r} + g_\omega^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\omega r}}{r} + g_\rho^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\rho r}}{r} \\ & + g_\phi^2 \frac{e^{\mu_\phi r}}{r} + g_{D^*}^2 \frac{e^{\mu_{D^*} r}}{r}. \end{aligned} \quad (275)$$

When we consider the interaction between two protons or two neutrons we have the same mesons. We can, then, propose a more complete Walecka's Lagrangian (using Walecka's notation and constants) for the nucleon-nucleon interaction:

$$\begin{aligned} L = & -\hbar c \left[\bar{\psi} \left(\gamma_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial x_\lambda} + M \right) \psi \right] \\ & - \frac{c^2}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial \phi^j}{\partial x_\lambda} \right)^2 + (\mu^j)^2 (\phi^j)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{4} F_{\lambda\nu}^j F_{\lambda\nu}^j \\ & - \frac{(m^j)^2}{2} V_\lambda^j V_\lambda^j + i g_\sigma^j \bar{\psi} \gamma_\lambda \psi V_\lambda^j + g_s^j \bar{\psi} \gamma^5 \psi \phi^j, \end{aligned} \quad (276)$$

where a summation on j is implied. The nucleon field of mass m_N is ψ , ϕ^j is a neutral scalar meson field of mass m_s^j , V_λ^j is a neutral vector meson field of mass m_v^j , and F_λ^j is the field tensor associated to the field V_λ^j . The quantities M , μ^j , and m^j are the inverse Compton wavelengths $M = \frac{m_N c}{\hbar}$, $\mu^j = \frac{m_s^j c}{\hbar}$, and $m^j = \frac{m_v^j c}{\hbar}$. The index j runs from 1 to 4 in order to take into account the scalar mesons π , η , D , and B , and the vector mesons ω , ρ , ϕ , and D^* . The masses of these mesons are within one order of magnitude.

On the other hand the p_3 of the neutron outer shell does not decay because the deuteron is stable. Its stability happens due to the binding with p_1 (or p_2) by means of supergluons and by the exchange of mesons depending on the supercolors. As we see in Fig. 10.4 the deuteron exhibits a large quadrupole moment. There are two cores with equal positive charges, $+1/2$ each. Because of the pair $p_1 - p_3$ there is a net positive charge of about $+2/3$ in the middle, between the two cores. And there is a negative charge cloud of $-1/3$ on each side, around each core. Such distribution produces two opposite electric dipole moments of about $(1/3) \times 0.6 \text{e}(\text{fm})$ and, therefore, a quadrupole moment of about $0.2 \text{e}(\text{fm}) \times 1(\text{fm}) = 2 \times 10^{-3} \text{e}(\text{barn})$, which is close to the experimental value of $2.82 \times 10^{-3} \text{e}(\text{barn})^{(4)}$. *Pointlike quarks moving randomly can not produce such moments.* Without considering the above model, since the deuteron has three d quarks we would expect it to be a very unstable system that would decay very fast.

In the light of what was discussed above we can understand the large decay constant of triton. We know that the spins of the two neutrons cancel each other so that the spin of triton comes from the proton. The configuration of primons (and quarks) of the system is described below in Fig. 10.5. There is a net binding between p_1 and the two p_3 's. Actually, it must be an alternate binding between p_1 and each p_3 . This binding makes p_3 more stable so that instead of decaying in 920s it decays in about $3.87 \times 10^8 \text{s}$. The addition of another p_1 would make the system completely stable. Therefore, the alpha particle primon configuration should be given by Fig. 10.6 and **it has a planar configuration and not a pyramidal one**. Due to the attraction of the four inner shells the system is very tightly bound and, of course, very stable. The eight p_2 's of the outer layers will tend to stay away from each other. We infer, thus, that the system has the following electric charge distribution: the center (the region where the two p_1 's and the two p_3 's are) has a net charge of about $2 \times (+5/6) - 2 \times (-1/6) = +4/3$; a middle region (corresponding to the position of the four inner shells) with a charge of about $4 \times (+1/2) = +2$; and an outer region (corresponding to the positions of the eight p_2 's) with a charge of $8 \times (-1/6) = -4/3$. The system, of course, as we see, has no quadrupole moment. It is interesting to notice that an alpha particle is not, therefore, a system of two deuterons. In this way we explain that the saturation of the nuclear force is quite similar to the saturation of chemical bonds. We can also understand the reason behind the tensorial character of the nuclear force, which arises simply due to the spatial arrangement of primons.

The spatial arrangements of primons (and quarks) in the triton and in the

alpha particle are quite in line with the work of Abbas⁵. According to his work the alpha particle has a hole at the center with a size of about 1 fm. The hole, of course, exists because of the repulsive and attractive forces between the four closest primons (Fig. 10.6).

10.2 The Absence of Nuclides with A=5 and the Instability of Be^8

It is well known that there is no nuclide with A=5. It simply does not form, even for a brief time. Why is it so? Taking a look at the primon configuration of the alpha particle we can understand why. As we saw above the binding happens in the middle among the four primons: the two pairs of $p_1 - p_3$. Besides, it is a planar structure. Thus, there is no room for another nucleon, that is, there is no bond left. We have a strong binding if we put a neutron on one side and a proton on the other side (with opposite spins) because in this case there will be another bond $p_1 - p_3$. That is why Li^6 is stable. It is also possible to put two protons (with opposite spins) to form He^6 . The binding between them occurs via the bonding $p_1 - p_2$. In this case the whole binding is not as strong as in Li^6 , and He^6 is unstable and decays in about 0.81s.

We can also see that it is impossible to bind two alpha particles since there is no bond left in any of them. Actually, the bonding could occur only by means of the p'_2 s of the outer layers, but there is no bonding between equal primons and, therefore, the binding does not take place. We know that Be^8 is formed only for an extremely brief time (about 10^{-23} s) and breaks up into two alpha particles.

We should investigate how we can form all nuclides by arranging nucleons in a way to form the bondings among primons, and try to relate the total spin to each arrangement of primons. In the case of Li^6 and He^6 we clearly see that $J = 0$.

References

1. M. Lacombe, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C21**, 861 (1980).
2. W. N. Cottingham and D. A. Greenwood, in *An Introduction to Nuclear Physics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1992).
3. J.D. Walecka, *Annals of Phys.* **83**, 491 (1974).
4. H. G. Kolsky, T.E. Phipps, Jr., N.F. Tamsey, and H.B. Silsbee, *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 395 (1952); recalculated by E.P. Auffray, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **6**, 120 (1961).
5. A. Abbas, nucl-th/9911074. A. Abbas, nucl-th/9911074.

Appendix: Brief Vita

BSc in Physics: Universidade Federal de Pernambuco,
Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

MSc.(courses only) in Nuclear Engineering:
Universidade Federal de Pernambuco,
Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

MSc in Physics: Universidade Federal de Pernambuco,
Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

PhD in Physics: University of Illinois at Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois, USA




Fig. 10.1 The most important terms of the Paris nuclear potential.




Fig. 2.1. Configuration of the spins of primons and quarks in the proton.




Diagram 1




Fig. 4.1 The usual QCD potential $V = -\frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s}{r} + \beta r$ ($\beta = 1 \text{ GeV fm}^{-1}$) and a Yukawa potential of the type $V = -\frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_s}{r} e^{-\mu_c r}$ with $\mu_c = 1 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, and $(g_s^2)^2 = \alpha_s$.






Fig. 6.1. Representation of the ejection of matter from the center of a spiral galaxy. As time goes by the jet curves and gives origin to the two spiral arms. As it goes outwards the gas gains angular momentum at the expense of the galactic bulge which loses angular momentum by shedding matter outwards. Since the tangential velocity remains constant after leaving the bulge the mass gets more and more delayed with respect to the galactic bulge. This overall effect forms the spiral structure. As it goes outwards the mass describes the curve C which is approximately a logarithmic spiral as seen in an inertial frame fixed at the center of the galaxy.



(a)



(b)

Fig. 2.2 Distribution of electric charge (a) in the proton and (b) in the neutron. The area under the curve is equal to each particle's charge.




Fig. 4.2 The data points were found at the CERN $p\bar{p}$ collider, at $q^2 \approx 2000$ GeV^2 . One clearly sees that the first point at the left is off the straight line and shows some sort of saturation, indicating a Yukawa type of potential.




Fig. 6.2 Ejection of matter from the center of a spiral galaxy seen in a frame that rotates together with the bulge of the galaxy.




Fig. 10.3 One of the arrangements of supercolors and spins of primons in the deuteron ($S=1$). Probably the shells are no longer spherical and have been drawn for guidance only.




Fig. 2.3 The arrangement of primons in the proton. The two mean radii are approximately to scale, according to the two peaks seen in Fig. 2a. The small white circle is p_1 , the large white circle is p_2 , and the black circle is p_3 . The sizes of these circles do not mean anything, since primons are supposed to be pointlike. The supercolors are α , β and γ . The primons in each layer have different supercolors. The thick black lines mean the strong bonds that link primons, that is, they mean the quarks, and the thin black lines mean the weak bonds between any two primons. Due to the exchange of gluons the weak bonds change all the time. The large circles represent the mean radii of the two shells.




Fig. 10.4 The arrangement of primons in the deuteron for understanding the stability of the neutron in the system. The stability happens due to the exchange of supergluons, and mesons (pions, ω , etc.) between p_3 and p_1 (shown above), and between p_3 and p_2 .




Fig. 2.4 The arrangement of primons in the neutron. The two mean radii are approximately to scale, according to the two peaks seen in Fig. 2b. The small white circle is p_1 , the large white circle is p_2 , and the black circle is p_3 . The sizes of these circles do not mean anything, since primons are supposed to be pointlike. The supercolors are α , β and γ . The primons in each layer have different supercolors.




Fig. 10.5 The configuration of primons (and quarks) in the triton. The arrows indicate the spin directions. The total spin is $1/2$. Most of the binding happens between p_1 and the two p_3 's and slows down the decay of p_3 . Probably all shells are no longer spherical, so that the above circles may be substituted by other more realistic curves. Of course, it is not an easy task since we are dealing with a very complex system. The figure shows just a few weak bonds.




Fig. 2.5 Potentials of quarks u , s , c , b , and t . The ground state levels are given by m_u , m_s , m_c , m_b , and m_t . The larger the ground state is, the narrower and deeper should be the corresponding potential well. The level of the d quark is not shown. The equilibrium distance between any two protons is r_0 .






Fig. 10.6 The arrangement of primons in the alpha particle. Probably the $p-p$ bond is perpendicular to the $n-n$ bond. The arrows indicate the spin directions. The total spin is zero. We easily see that the system has no quadrupole moment. We expect that there should exist attraction among the inner shells. Probably all shells are no longer spherical, so that the above circles may be substituted by other more realistic curves. Of course, it is not an easy task since we are dealing with a very complex system. Only four weak bonds are shown.



(a)



(b)

Figs. 2.6a and 2.6b Experimental data on the structure functions of the nucleons, as measured in deep inelastic electron scattering at the Stanford Linear Accelerator.