

# The Planck Mass Particle Finally Discovered!

## The True God Particle!

### Good bye to the Point Particle Hypothesis!

Espen Gaarder Haug\*  
Norwegian University of Life Sciences

September 11, 2016

#### Abstract

In this paper we suggest that one single fundamental particle exists behind all matter and energy. We claim that this particle has a spatial dimension and diameter equal to the Planck length and a mass equal to half of the Planck mass. Further, we will claim this particle is indivisible, that is it was never created and can never be destroyed. All other subatomic particles, in spite of having much lower masses than the Planck mass, are easily explained by the existence of such an indivisible particle. Isaac Newton stated that there had to be a fundamental particle, completely hard, that could not be broken down. He also claimed that light consisted of a stream of such particles. Newton's particle theory was very similar to that of the ancient atomists Democritus and Leucippus; see, for example, [1, 2, 3, 4]. However, the atomist view of an indivisible particle with spatial dimensions has generally been pushed aside by modern physics and replaced with hypothetical point particles and the mysterious wave-particle duality.

Although the Planck mass is enormous compared to any known subatomic particles, including the Higgs particle, we will explain how all known subatomic particles contain and are created from the Planck mass. In this paper we will show that the Planck mass is found everywhere at the subatomic level and that the Planck mass probably consists of two indivisible particles. There are good reasons to believe that the Planck mass can only exist for an instant equal to a Planck second. We show that what modern physics considers a rest-mass is, in reality, "objects" rapidly fluctuating between their mass state and an energy state.

Our new view of matter and energy seems to address a series of unsolved problems in modern physics, including the question of why we have not observed a particle with a mass close to the Planck mass, despite the fact that the Planck mass plays an important role in certain aspects of theoretical physics. We also show how our view of matter and energy is consistent with Heisenberg's Uncertainty principle, but gives a different and more logical interpretation than the interpretation given by modern quantum mechanics. Further, our theory offers a completely new interpretation of the so-called Schwarzschild radius at the subatomic scale. In the last section we provide a new solution to Einstein's infinite mass problem. As we show, all elementary particles will turn into energy just before they reach the speed of light. In other words, there is no need for infinite energy to accelerate a mass to the speed of light. This does not replace Einstein's relativistic mass formula, which we claim is correct; it only gives additional insight on how it should be used based on new perspective on what mass truly is.

**Key words:** Planck mass, Planck particle, Motz particle, indivisible particle, energy, mass, spatial dimension, Heisenberg's Uncertainty principle, mini black-holes, relativistic mass limit.

## 1 Introduction

Isaac Newton assumed that everything, including light, consists of solid, hard, impenetrable moving particles or, in Newton's own words, [5]:

*All these things being consider'd it seems probable to me, that God in the Beginning form'd Matter in solid, massy, hard, impenetrable, movable Particles, of such Sizes and Figures, and in*

---

\*e-mail [espenhaug@mac.com](mailto:espenhaug@mac.com). Thanks to Victoria Terces for helping me edit this manuscript and thanks to Traden4Alpha for useful comments and to Jeremy Dunning-Davies for pointing me towards some very interesting older references that I not was aware of. Also thanks to Alan Lewis, Daniel Duffy, Ppauper and AvT and for useful tips on how to do high precision calculations.

*such Proportion to Space, as most conduce to the End for which he form'd them; and that these primitive Particles being Solids, are incomparably harder than any porous Bodies compounded of them; even so very hard, as never to wear or break in pieces; no ordinary Power being able to divide what God himself made one in the first Creation. While the Particles continue entire, they may compose bodies of one and the same Nature and Texture in all Ages; But should they wear away, or break in pieces, the Nature of Things depending on them, would be changed. Those minute rondures, swimming in space, from the stuff of the world: the solid, coloured table I write on, no, less than the thin invisible air I breathe, is constructed out of small colourless corpuscles; the world at close quarters looks like the night sky – a few dots of stuff, scattered sporadically through and empty vastness. Such is modern corpuscularianism.*

The corpuscular particles of Newton were very similar to the ancient atomist view of matter: that everything consisted of indivisible particles moving in the void. The void can be imagined as empty space, but it is more than that, as all observable subatomic particles consist of indivisible particles and void; see [6] for an in-depth discussion on this. In this paper we will suggest that by reintroducing an indivisible particle we will be able to tackle some of the unsolved problems in modern physics. We suggest that the modern hypothesis of point particles, rather than a fundamental indivisible particle with spatial dimensions, is one of the main causes of much of the non-intuitive interpretations in some areas of modern physics.

Before we reunite the Newton corpuscular God particle, which is rooted in ancient atomism, with modern physics we will briefly discuss the Planck mass and the Planck particle. The Planck mass and a series of Planck units play an important role in modern physics. And yet even physicists involved with the Large Hadron Collider have not observed a subatomic particle with a mass even close to the Planck mass.

In 1906, Max Planck introduced the following mass  $m_p = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} \approx 2.17651 \times 10^{-8}$  kg, see [7]. This is an extremely large mass compared to the mass of all known subatomic particles. The Planck mass is about the same as that of a flea egg; to put it in context – the mass is so large that we can relate it to something macroscopic. The Planck mass is equal to  $1.3 \times 10^{19}$  the proton masses and about  $2.4 \times 10^{22}$  the electron masses. Its mass is enormous compared to any subatomic particle and even to the mass of the heaviest atoms. Table 1 list the mass as well as the reduced Compton wavelength of some elementary particles. As we can see from the table, even the large Higgs particle mass is incredibly small compared to the Planck mass. While the Planck mass is very large, its reduced Compton wavelength:  $\frac{\hbar}{m_p c}$  is equal to the Planck length  $l_p \approx 1.6162 \times 10^{-35}$  meter, and this is incredibly small compared to the reduced Compton wavelength of all known particles in present day particle physics.

Particle	Mass	Particles per Planck mass	Reduced Compton Wavelength
Planck mass	2.177E-08	1	1.616E-35
Higgs particle	2.230E-25	9.760E+16	1.577E-18
Neutron	1.675E-27	1.299E+19	2.100E-16
Proton	1.673E-27	1.301E+19	2.103E-16
Electron	9.109E-31	2.389E+22	3.862E-13

Table 1: The mass and reduced Compton wavelength of some particles.

Lloyd Motz, while working at the Rutherford Laboratory, [8, 9, 10] suggested that there was probably a very fundamental particle with a mass equal to the Planck mass. Motz named this particle the *uniton*.<sup>1</sup> Motz suggested that the uniton could be the most fundamental of all particles and that all other particles were initially made of unitons. Motz acknowledged that his unitons (Planck mass particle) had far too much mass compared to known subatomic masses. He tried to get around this issue by claiming the unitons had radiated most of their energy away:

According to this point of view electrons and nucleons are the lowest bound states of two or more unitons that have collapsed down to the appropriate dimensions gravitationally and radiated away most of their energy in the process. – Lloyd Motz

Others have suggested that there were plenty of Planck mass type particles around just after the Big Bang, see [12], but that most of the mass of these super heavy particles has radiated away. Modern physics has also suggested a hypothetical Planck particle that has  $\sqrt{\pi}$  more mass than the uniton suggested

<sup>1</sup>See also [11] that introduces a similar particle that he calls maximons.

by Motz. Some physicists including Motz and Hawking has suggested such particles could be micro-black-holes [13, 14, 15]. Planck mass particles has even been suggested as a candidate for cosmological dark matter, [16, 17]. Others again, like Crothers and Dunning-Davies [18], have strongly criticized the black-hole interpretation of the Planck particle and have even questioned the existence of the Planck particle. Even the existence of Planck mass size particles reminds a unsolved mystery. We think current interpretations of the Planck mass and Planck type particles do not make much sense and instead we offer a fresh alternative based on an ancient way of looking at matter and energy. In the final section of the paper we will even give a new interpretation of so called mini-black holes.

Here we will assume there ultimately is only one fundamental particle and this particle makes up all other particles, as well as energy. We will assume that this particle has the following properties:

1. Indivisible particle with a diameter of  $l_p$  and a “rest” mass equal to half that of the Planck mass.
2. This indivisible particle is always traveling at the speed of light,  $c$  as measured with Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks.
3. This particle travels in the void (“empty space”). This is necessary, so the particles have something to travel in.

In other words, our indivisible particle has half the mass of the uniton particle suggested by Motz in 1962 (Planck mass size particle). In 1979, Motz and Epstein [14] suggested there likely existed a fundamental particle with half the Planck mass, that is exactly the same mass as in the particle suggested here<sup>2</sup>. Still they did not have a good explanations for why this particle was so much larger than all existing subatomic particles, what this “particle” truly was, and if it was indivisible or not. Instead of assuming that most of this super heavy particle mass has radiated away, we will suggest that all mass (and energy) of the indivisible particle “hides” inside each known subatomic particle and even inside energy. To get this to work we will have to understand energy and mass from a new perspective, that is from a much simpler and more logical perspective than given by modern particle physics.

If the indivisible particles make up both energy and matter, then how can energy and matter appear to be so different? As first explained by Haug [6] based on atomism, the only difference between energy and matter is how the indivisible particles move relative to each other. Energy is simply indivisible particles moving in the same direction (at the speed of light) after each other, while matter is indivisible particles moving back and forth at the round-trip speed of light and counter-striking with each other.

Haug [6] has shown how this view of matter and energy leads to all of the well known formulas of special relativity theory, including  $E = mc^2$  and  $E = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$ , as well as relativistic Doppler shift and more. For example, length contraction has to do with a reduction in the void-distance between a group of indivisible particles. Still, Haug [6] has not shown before how his theory directly can be linked to the Planck mass, as well as known subatomic particles such as the electron. That is what I will show here. We will define mass as existing only at the instant when two indivisible particles collide, what we will call a counter-strike. At a typical collision, there is normally some damage, but as the indivisible particles are indivisible and have no parts, they are unchanged after collision, so counter-strike is a better word to describe such an event. All they do at counter-strike is to change the direction of movement. What two fully hard bodies do when they collide was one of the most difficult and significant questions during the 16th century; giants like Newton and Descartes attempted to answer this question, but it was not resolved at that time, see [5].

As shown by [19, 20] the Planck mass can also be rewritten (without changing its value) as

$$m_p = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \approx 2.17651 \times 10^{-8} \text{kg} \quad (1)$$

We will assume that the indivisible particle (the sole fundamental particle) has a mass of half the Planck mass, that is:

$$m_i = \frac{1}{2} m_p = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} \quad (2)$$

We use the notation  $m_i$  as mathematical symbol for the indivisible particle mass. Still, at all instants when an indivisible particle does not collide it is energy and this is then its potential mass. More precisely, indivisible particles that are, at any instant, not counter-striking (colliding) are what can be considered as pure energy. When they are counter-striking, we can consider them as half the Planck mass.

Even if this counter-strike collision only lasts for an instant, we will claim for hypothetical observable purposes that it lasts for one Planck second, that is  $t_p = \frac{l_p}{c}$ . This is because if we have a zero time

---

<sup>2</sup>I discovered this 1979 paper of Motz and Epstein first after putting out version 2 of this paper on Vixra. They are, from what I have found out so far, the first ones that have suggested a fundamental particle with this mass.

interval, then how could we talk about mass or even observe any mass? Observations require time and due to the diameter of the indivisible particle, the minimum time interval we can measure hypothetically is the Planck time. With the caveat hypothetically, I am simply thinking that even if we had the most advanced equipment available, this is something that possibly only can be done in a thought experiment at this time. Even so, experimental physics and logic strongly point towards the atomist view of matter and energy. Later we will look at mass in a slightly different view that involves continuous time.

Based on Einstein's formula  $E = mc^2$  we know that a mass at rest contains a large energy potential [21, 22, 23]. We will here claim that energy (photons, electromagnetism) also has built-in mass potential. This lies in contradiction with modern physics interpretations that claim photons have absolutely zero mass, that they are massless. In our view, photons have zero rest-mass as long as they are not counter-striking; in this case, the photons have only potential mass. The photons are nothing other than indivisible particles moving after each other in the same direction (similar to the Newton model of light). Some will possibly immediately claim this is invalid based on the modern wave particle view. We will however claim that the experiments used to support the wave-particle duality stand on thin ground. We are not the first ones questioning the wave-particle hypothesis, see for example [24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. Interestingly, others have also recently brought atomism back into the discussion of modern physics and quantization, see [29].

Only the counter-striking between indivisible particles produces what we can call mass, or rather lies at the origin of what we call mass. Just at the instant two indivisible particles counter-strike, they are combined a Planck mass, as illustrated in this figure 1

$$m_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \quad m_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c}$$

$$m_p = m_i + m_i = \frac{1}{2} m_p + \frac{1}{2} m_p = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}$$

Figure 1: Illustration of Planck mass. A Planck mass exists in the moment two indivisible particles counter-strike. Each indivisible particle has a mass of half the Planck mass.

The small arrows illustrate that the indivisible particles will immediately move in opposite directions after a counter-strike. So even if the Planck mass is incredibly large compared to known subatomic particles, it only lasts for an instant before being dissolved into energy (non-colliding indivisible particles) again. The shortest time (the instant) we hypothetically can measure the existence of a Planck mass is likely to be a Planck second  $t_p = \frac{l_p}{c}$ , which is simply the diameter of the indivisible particle divided by the speed of light. We can say that the Planck mass lasts only a Planck second. Just after the instant of the counter-strike (the creation of mass), the two indivisible particles separate and are no longer a mass; they are now energy again. Each indivisible particle, when not counter-striking, only has potential mass, but no rest-mass. Each indivisible particle then has potential mass equal to half the Planck mass. Only at counter-strike the indivisible particles are at rest for an instant, so they have rest-mass, but only for a Planck second from an observable point of view.

Interesting to note in this context is that the Larmor radiation formula [30], when working with the charge of Planck masses, will radiate into energy within a Planck second, see [31]. However, the interpretation of radiation from Planck masses will be very different here than in modern physics. Despite their many very accurate formulas for energy, it is important to note that modern physics actually has no deep explanation of what energy is exactly; as Richard Feynman once said:

*It is important to realize that in physics today, we have no knowledge what energy is.*

Radiation into energy from a modern atomist point of view simply means the two indivisible particles have left their counter-striking state; this likely happens in an instant, but from an observer's point of view it will take a Planck second to see this change, even in the best possible thought experiment set-up. The Larmor formula further indirectly predicts that the Planck acceleration is from zero to the speed of light in a Planck second. The interpretation of this from the atomist point of view is simply that the indivisible particle, upon a counter-strike with another indivisible particle, changes its course of direction

instantaneously and continues at the speed of light, but now it is moving in the opposite direction from its original path. Even if at the deepest level this happens instantaneously, it would theoretically take a minimum of one Planck second to measure this acceleration. In atomism the only things that exist at the depth of reality are indivisible particles and void, and the only thing we can observe is counter-strikes between indivisible particles. The diameter of an indivisible particle is, in our theory, equal to the Planck length  $l_p$  and since the indivisible particles always moves with speed of light  $c$ , it would take a Planck second to see an indivisible particle leave or arrive. Even the most precise measuring device would have to be constructed of indivisible particles with diameter  $l_p$ .

So far we have discussed what we assume the Planck mass particle is, but nobody has ever observed a Planck particle and it is fair to ask how is all this related to our modern observed particles that are so much smaller than the Planck mass. One can think of an electron as two indivisible particles moving back and forth over a distance equal to the twice the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron (each moving the reduced Compton wavelength for each counter-strike). That is to say, each indivisible particle will counter-strike every time it has moved a distance equal to the reduced Compton wavelength.<sup>3</sup>

The indivisible particle is moving along reduced Compton wavelength at the speed of light. Because the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron is much longer than the diameter of the indivisible particle, this means there are only  $\frac{c}{\lambda_e}$  counter-strikes per second. If we assume the hypothetical time to observe the counter-strike between two indivisible particles is  $\frac{l_p}{c}$ , then the amount of counter-strikes in a electron can be seen as a fraction of  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda_e}$  relative to a Planck mass, even if the electron consists of a Planck mass (counter-strikes).

It is very important that the round-trip speed of the indivisible particle is  $c$ . If the speed was slower or faster than this, then the indivisible particle model explaining mass as counter-strikes would not have worked to describe such things as the mass of the electron. One should also see this paper in connection with the many derivations done by Haug 2014 showing that special relativity can be derived directly from indivisible particles and void.

Each time each the indivisible particles that make up the electron have traveled the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron, they counter-strike. In other words, the electron is in reality in a mass state only a fraction of the time. This is why the Planck mass can be so enormous compared to the electron rest-mass and still make up the electron as well as any other subatomic particle. The number of transitions between mass and energy for example for an electron is  $7.76 \times 10^{20}$  times per second.

We can say the electron is  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda_e}$  fraction of a Planck mass. This means the electron must have a mass as a function of the Planck mass equal to the well known

$$m_e = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_e} m_p = \frac{1.6162 \times 10^{-35}}{3.86159 \times 10^{-13}} \times 2.17651 \times 10^{-8} \approx 9.1094 \times 10^{-31} \text{kg} \quad (3)$$

One could even say that all detected particles with so called rest-mass never, even when at so called rest, are constantly in a mass state, but rapidly are going between being in a mass state when their indivisible particles are counter-striking and in an energy state when they are not counter-striking. This naturally means matter and energy are almost the same and it explains why we can turn mass into energy and energy into mass. We can say the energy in a rest-mass is used to maintain the mass and the potential mass is used to maintain the energy. The shorter the reduced Compton wavelength, the more frequent will the indivisibles making up the mass counter-strike and the more mass the particle will contain. With a very short Compton wavelength, the mass will approach the Planck mass, because it then will counter-strike very frequently. Further, we can say that an indivisible particle is matter-like when it travels back and forth in a “stable” pattern, counter striking with other indivisible particles, and it is energy-like when it is freed from this pattern.

Figure 2 illustrates an electron

Every observable particle mass can mathematically be described as

$$m = \frac{l_p}{\bar{\lambda}} m_p = \frac{l_p}{\bar{\lambda}} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{\lambda}$  is the reduced Compton wavelength of the particle of interest. The factor  $\frac{l_p}{\bar{\lambda}}$  is the factor deciding how often the particular particle ticks (counter-strikes) compared to the maximum mass of a subatomic particle, which is the Planck mass. Each so-called elementary particle is nothing more than (minimum) two indivisible particles moving back and forth over a distance and counter-striking. What we consider particles are in reality not constantly in a mass state, that is they do not have continuously internal counter-strikes between the indivisible particles making them up. Particles are like discrete

<sup>3</sup>Bear in mind that the mutual velocity (also known as the closing speed) as observed from a reference frame different than the two indivisible particles  $2c$  even under Einstein’s special relativity theory, see [32] for a historical overview




Figure 2: Illustration of Electron mass. An Electron is much smaller than the Planck mass as the mass event only takes up  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda_e}$  of the size (length) of the electron.

ticking clocks and at each tick they are a Planck mass. The shorter the reduced Compton wavelength is, the more frequent the counter-strikes (ticks) will be and therefore the larger the mass of the particle is. In practice things are more complicated; one would also need to take into account surrounding indivisible particles entering and leaving the mass (space) of interest.

For indivisible particles traveling after one another in the same direction (energy) (and not back and forth), there will not be counter striking (as long as they are not colliding with other particles going in their way). This means that their equivalent matter distance (reduced Compton wavelength) is infinite  $\bar{\lambda} \approx \infty$  and we can therefore say that a non-counter-striking indivisible particle must have the following rest-mass

$$m_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{\infty c} = 0 \quad (5)$$

That the Compton wavelength is infinite for a photon is nothing new and has been pointed out by Hawking in 1971 [13], for example. Zero rest-mass simply means that even though it is not counter-striking, the indivisible particle still has a potential mass of half the Planck mass. The potential mass is turning into “rest-mass” when it is counter-striking another indivisible particle; this is the only moment during which it is at rest. More precisely, that is the only moment it changes its direction, and in the instant between changing direction we can say it is at “rest”. Rest-mass is related to the number of times indivisible particles are at rest (counter-striking), and this again is dependent on the so-called reduced Compton wavelength of the subatomic particle. Under atomism the reduced Compton wavelength has nothing to do with a wave, but has to do with the void distance between the indivisible particles making up the mass.

The void-distance between indivisible particles in a beam of energy, that is indivisible particles moving after each other will have very different implications than an identical reduced Compton wavelength. For example, two indivisible particles traveling after each other could have a void-distance (what modern physics think is a wavelength) equal to the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron. Still this would not be the matter length of the indivisibles, as a matter length (reduced Compton wavelength) is the length an indivisible particle travels back and forth in a stable pattern in between each counter-strike.

Table 2 illustrates how all masses theoretically can be constructed from two indivisible particles that together have a mass equal to the Planck mass.

Table 3 lists a series of properties of the assumed indivisible particle. What is of great importance is that the indivisible particle must always travel with the speed<sup>4</sup> of light  $c$ , its diameter must be  $l_p$  and its mass must be half the Planck mass, and the Planck mass last for a Planck second as seen from a observer. Like the atomist Giordano Bruno<sup>5</sup>, we are assuming that all indivisible particle are uniform and sphere shaped; this leads to a series of properties such as the circumference, surface area, and volume that also are listed in the table. To what degree these particular properties (below the line) potentially will have

<sup>4</sup>As measured with Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks.

<sup>5</sup>Who was burnt by the stake for his view.

Particle	Mass ( kg )	Time-speed ( s/m )
Indivisible particle	$m_i = 1.088\text{E-}08$	None
Planck mass particle (Motz)	$m_p = 2.177\text{E-}08$	3.34E-09
Higgs particle	$m_h = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_h} m_p = 2.230\text{E-}25$	3.42E-26
Neutron	$m_N = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_n} m_p = 1.675\text{E-}27$	2.57E-28
Proton	$m_P = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_p} m_p = 1.673\text{E-}27$	2.56E-28
Electron	$m_e = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_e} m_p = 9.109\text{E-}31$	1.40E-31

Table 2: The table shows the mass in kg and the mass in time-speed for some subatomic particles.

any importance in deriving useful physics formulas or to give us deeper insight in existing physics is unclear.

Property	SI Units	Dimensionless $l_p = 1, c = 1$
Diameter	$D_i = l_p \approx 1.616\text{E-}35$ m	1 ( L )
Radius	$r_i = \frac{1}{2}l_p \approx 8.081\text{E-}36$ m	0.5 ( L )
Schwarzschild radius	$r_s = l_p \approx 1.616\text{E-}35$ m	1 ( L )
Round-trip speed	$c = 299,792,458$ m/s	1 ( L/T )
Potential mass at hit	$m_i = \frac{1}{2}m_p = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \approx 1.088\text{E-}08$ kg	3.2625...( M )
Potential mass at hit	$m_i = \frac{1}{2}m_p = \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{c} \approx 1.668\text{E-}09$ time-speed	0.5 ( T/L )
Energy	$E_i = \frac{1}{2}m_p c^2 = \frac{1}{2}\frac{\hbar}{l_p} c \approx 978,074,758$ J	3.2625.. .
Potential charge	$q_i = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{c}}\sqrt{10^7} \approx 9.38\text{E-}19$ C	4,038.88...
<b>Other properties with potential future interest:</b>		
Circumference	$C_i = \pi l_p \approx 5.077\text{E-}35$ m	$\pi$ ( L )
Sphere surface area	$A_i = \pi l_p^2 \approx 8.206\text{E-}70$ $m^2$	$\pi$ ( $L^2$ )
Sphere volume	$V_i = \frac{1}{6}\pi l_p^3 \approx 2.210\text{E-}105$ $m^3$	$\frac{1}{6}\pi$ ( $L^3$ )
Equivalent square area	$l_p^2 = 2.612\text{E-}70$ $m^2$	1 ( $L^2$ )
Equivalent cube volume	$l_p^3 = 4.222\text{E-}105$ $m^3$	1 ( L )

Table 3: The table shows the properties of the indivisible particle.

Based on the analysis above, the mass of this most fundamental particle is half the Planck mass and this also means its mass is related to half the reduced Planck constant,  $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$ , rather than  $\hbar$ . The constant  $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$  has recently been described by [34] as the forgotten constant. We think indeed  $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$  can be seen as an even more fundamental constant than  $\hbar$ , since the indivisible particle seems to be the only truly fundamental particle making up all energy and matter. D'Angelo also introduces the Planck circumference identical to the one listed in the table here and links it to atomism.<sup>6</sup>

## 2 Mass as kg and Mass as Time-Speed

In modern physics, mass is typically given in the notation of kg. For example, a Planck mass in kg is given by

$$m_p = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \approx 2.17651 \times 10^{-8} \text{kg} \quad (6)$$

Further, an electron mass is given by

$$m_e = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_e} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_e} \frac{1}{c} \approx 9.1094 \times 10^{-31} \text{kg} \quad (7)$$

Both  $G$  and  $\hbar$  are related to kg. In 2014, Haug has shown that mass also can be derived and analyzed from atomism without kg and without relation to  $G$ . Haug also introduced what he calls time-speed. As

<sup>6</sup>I think D'Angelo has important points related to reintroducing  $\frac{1}{2}\hbar$  and also the circumference of the indivisible particle. However, I doubt that the constant he calls the Democritean unit  $Y' = 8.134865168 \times 10^{-54}$  has anything directly to do with the indivisible particles other than being another constant useful for some calculation purposes. Still, only time will tell if there is more to it.

we have explained above, mass is actually related to counter-strikes between indivisible particles. Such counter-strikes are not only the foundation of mass, but they are also the foundation of time. Only counter-strikes can cause observable changes and time is change. Each counter-strike (mass event) can be seen as a tick of time. Every subatomic particle can be seen as a discrete clock with its own clock frequency, that is number of ticks per second. With time-speed we simply think about the number times the indivisibles counter-strike compared to an ideal mass where there are continuous counter-strikes. We can think of an ideal fully solid mass where a series of Planck particles are laid out next to each (or approximately next to each other). The indivisible particles always move at the speed of light and if they are lying approximately side-by-side, then they will continuously counter-strike. This means the time-speed of a Planck mass can be described as simply

$$\hat{m}_p = \frac{l_p}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{c} = 3.33564095198152 \times 10^{-09} \text{ continuous seconds per meter} \quad (8)$$

That is to say, the dimension of a mass in the form of time-speed is  $\frac{T}{L}$ . Such an ideal mass is very useful for standardizing mass and comparing other masses to it. Continuously counter-striking can be seen as a continuous clock. For every meter an indivisible particle moves, it can maximum counter-strike an infinite number of times, or in other words it is can tick 3 continuous nano seconds for every meter it moves. Just as the Planck mass in kg  $2.17651 \times 10^{-8}$  can be seen as the most fundamental kg mass, then  $\frac{1}{c} = 3.33564095198152 \times 10^{-09} \approx 3$  nano seconds per meter, can be seen as the equivalent continuous time-speed of a Planck mass. An electron does not have continuous counter-strikes; it is not a continuously ticking clock. An electron is equivalent to

$$\hat{m}_e = \frac{l_p}{\lambda_e} \frac{1}{c} \approx 1.396 \times 10^{-31} \text{ continuous seconds per meter}, \quad (9)$$

continuous seconds per meter the indivisible particles moves. Thus if we know the Planck length and the reduced Compton wavelength of the mass of interest, we can do without the Planck constant or the Newton gravitational constant when we work with any mass, as well as with gravity. For an indivisible particle, we have the potential mass in form of time-speed equal to

$$\hat{m}_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{l_p}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{2c}, \quad (10)$$

this is also the rest-mass when counter-striking. Further, its rest-mass when it is not counter-striking is

$$\hat{m}_i = \frac{1}{2} \frac{l_p}{\infty} \frac{1}{c} = 0. \quad (11)$$

That an indivisible particle has no rest-mass when not counter-striking does not mean that it does not have a potential mass. It is energy and has potential mass (time-speed) when not counter-striking, and it has rest-mass (time-speed) and potential energy when counter-striking. Again, this is a new way of looking at matter and energy. It is a logical way where energy and mass not are something undefined only described by mathematical formulas combined with a series of “buzz” words. By dressing up atomism in mathematics and combining it with insight from modern physics, then physics is again truly Physics. Math is extremely useful and necessary to add precision to the language and to calculate what a theory predicts; this can then be compared to experiments and the world around us. Still, mathematical physics alone, no matter how well it fit experiments, is no guarantee for acquiring an in-depth understanding of reality. Atomism seems to come handy in here.

### 3 Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle in a New Perspective

Our new atomist view of matter and energy also seems to provide a new interpretation of Heisenberg’s Uncertainty principle. Heisenberg’s Uncertainty principle [35] is given by

$$\sigma_x \sigma_p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \quad (12)$$

where  $\sigma_x$  is considered to be the uncertainty in the position,  $\sigma_p$  is the uncertainty in the momentum, and  $\hbar$  is the reduced Planck constant. For an indivisible particle we must have



$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_x \sigma_p &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \\
\sigma_x &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2\sigma_p} \\
\sigma_x &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2m_i c} \\
\sigma_x &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2\frac{1}{2}m_p c} \\
\sigma_x &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2\frac{1}{2}\frac{\hbar}{l_p}\frac{1}{c}} \\
\sigma_x &\geq l_p
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

And this is no surprise; as the indivisible particle has a diameter of  $l_p$ , we cannot really say its location is inside or in a point inside its spatial dimension. The indivisible particle naturally covers its entire spatial dimension. So our minimum “uncertainty” concerning the exact position of the particle (in a one-dimensional analysis) must naturally be  $l_p$ . The word “uncertainty” is not a well-described term here, as this is simply the one-dimensional minimum length the particle always must occupy, see figure 3.<sup>7</sup>




Figure 3: Illustration of Atomism interpretation of Heisenberg’s Uncertainty principle for an indivisible particle with mass equal to half the Planck mass.

This removes some of the mystery of Heisenberg Uncertainty principle. From an atomist point of view, the Heisenberg Uncertainty principle simply confirms that at the very depth of reality we have indivisible particles with spatial-dimension and a diameter of  $l_p$ , rather than the non-logical hypothetical point particles. Still, all observable subatomic particles, like electrons, for example, are neither point particles nor particles with a spatial dimension equal to their reduced Compton wavelength. All observable subatomic particles consist of indivisible particles and void, and the indivisible particles with spatial dimension are moving at the speed of light along the reduced Compton wavelength.

Further, the momentum of an indivisible particle is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_x \sigma_p &= \frac{\hbar}{2} \\
\sigma_p &= \frac{\hbar}{2l_p} \\
\sigma_p &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{l_p}
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

<sup>7</sup>Based on special relativity theory we have length contraction and we should think this was frame dependent. As shown by Haug 2014, the length contraction is simply related to reduced void-distance between indivisible particles and the indivisible particles themselves cannot contract. But all masses consist of indivisible particles moving back and forth in the void.

which we already know, since the momentum of an indivisible particle must be

$$p_i = m_i c = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} c = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \quad (15)$$

We conclude that Heisenberg's Uncertainty principle formula makes logical sense for indivisible particles and opens up for a more logical interpretation based on an indivisible particle with spatial dimension and diameter  $l_p$ .

Next let us look at a subatomic particles with mass less than half the Planck mass, for example the electron,  $m_e$ . We claim the right interpretation here is given by using  $m_e c$  as the momentum of the electron, this gives the "uncertainty" in the position of

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2m_e c} \\ \sigma_x &\geq \frac{\hbar}{2 \frac{\hbar}{\lambda_e} \frac{1}{c} c} \\ \sigma_x &\geq \frac{\lambda_e}{2} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

This is fully consistent with atomism. The indivisible particle moves back and forth with the speed of light along the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron. And since the particle moves so fast, the best guess to minimize our error of where the indivisible particle relies on choosing the midpoint of the reduced Compton wavelength. Then we know it must be within half the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron. Similar can be done for any subatomic particles.

Modern physics is a top-down theory where one has tried to dig deeper and deeper with some wonderful success in formula derivations and predictions. However, modern physics is lost at understanding the depth of reality. Atomism on the other hand is mostly a bottom-up theory. This alone is not any guarantee for success, but the great progress in mathematical atomism in recent years is very promising. Based on atomism we "know" that an indivisible particle must take up a diameter of  $l_p$ . It is meaningless to try to pin point the location of the particle further, at least without talking about also the center of the particle and so on. Atomism does not need Heisenberg's Uncertainty principle to figure out the "uncertainty" (that is not really an uncertainty) in the particle extension. Still, atomism is fully consistent with the Heisenberg Uncertainty principle formula. Modern physics, with the hypothetical idea of point particles, often has the correct formulas but the interpretations seem to be far-fetched. In addition, their formulas can often be broken down into simpler formulas based on Planck quantization as recently shown by [19, 33]

## 4 Particle Radius or Point Particle?

Not so long ago it was assumed that known subatomic particles such as the electron had a radius. The modern view is that subatomic particles are point particles with no spatial-dimension. From the modern atomist perspective, neither of these views is correct. An observable subatomic particle, like an electron, does not have a radius. The electron is not a sphere. Based on atomism, the electron is also not a point particle. The electron likely consists of two indivisible particles (at a minimum) moving back and forth at the speed of light over a distance equal to twice the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron. Under atomism the only particle that has a spherical shape and does not consist of moving parts is the indivisible particle. It has a diameter equal to the Planck length and a radius equal to half the Planck length. Further, the indivisible particle is not a particle based on the criteria from modern physics, because it has no rest-mass, except when it is counter-striking; alone, when it is not counter-striking another indivisible particle, it only has potential mass (equal to half the Planck mass).

All known subatomic particles are not point particles, nor do they have a radius. Instead they consist of extremely small indivisible particles moving back and forth in a pattern at the speed of light counter-striking with each other. For modern physics this is a entirely new way of thinking about matter and energy. Based on atomism matter is characterized by an indivisible-void duality rather than a particle-wave duality. But under atomism this duality is nothing more mystical than indivisible particles always moving at the speed  $c$  in empty space (void).

## 5 Schwarzschild Radius of the Indivisible Particle

The so-called Schwarzschild radius is given by (see [36, 37, 38, 39, 40] )

$$r_s = \frac{2Gm}{c^2} \quad (17)$$

The particle with half the Planck mass is the only particle where the Schwarzschild radius is equal to the Planck length:

$$r_s = \frac{2Gm_i}{c^2} = \frac{2G\frac{1}{2}m_p}{c^2} = l_p \approx 1.6162 \times 10^{-35} \quad (18)$$

One can input the standard values of  $G$ , the Planck mass  $m_p$ , and  $c$  to check that it gives a Schwarzschild radius of  $l_p$ . Alternatively, based on recent findings by [19, 33, 41], it could also be written as

$$\begin{aligned} r_s &= \frac{2G\frac{1}{2}m_p}{c^2} \\ r_s &= \frac{2\frac{l_p^2 c^3}{h} \frac{1}{2} \frac{h}{l_p} \frac{1}{c}}{c^2} = l_p \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Most physicists assume that the Planck length plays an important role at the depth of reality. The indivisible particle is very unique; it must have a mass of half the Planck mass, its Schwarzschild “radius” is  $l_p$ , and furthermore, it is the only particle that has an escape velocity of  $c$  when we are operating all the way down to the Planck length  $l_p$

$$v_e = \sqrt{\frac{2Gm_i}{r_s}} = \sqrt{\frac{2G\frac{1}{2}m_p}{l_p}} = c \quad (20)$$

In our view, the half a Planck mass particle is an indivisible particle, always moving with the speed of light that makes up all other particles. The fact that it is directly related to the escape velocity with  $r = l_p$  simply confirms this concept. As we soon will see, this concept also leads to a new interpretation of so-called mini-black holes. The idea of an escape velocity and black holes actually goes all the way back to 1784 when Michell, based on Newtonian mechanics, speculated on what he called “dark stars”, see [42, 43, 44].

There exists a somewhat “competing” particle that is often called the Planck particle; among many physicist it has been interpreted as a mini-black hole. This is a particle with mass  $\sqrt{\pi}$  times the Planck mass. Its escape velocity is  $c$ , when using its Compton wavelength as the radius in the escape velocity formula. However, we do not think that this particle can exist and it is not as unique as some physicists might think, even from a mathematical point of view. See [18]. Alternatively, we can look at a mass with  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  times the Planck mass and when setting the reduced Compton wavelength (instead of the Compton wavelength) equal to the radius in the escape velocity formula, we again get an escape velocity of  $c$ . So is this yet another mini-black hole? We doubt it.

On the other hand, the indivisible particle does have many similarities with the originally conception of the properties of a black hole. The indivisible particle is indivisible, that is unbreakable; it is fully contained inside a length equal to the Schwarzschild radius and therefore nothing can escape from it, because it is singular and indivisible. Nothing radiates out from it or into it. There is no Hawking radiation from an indivisible particle. The indivisible particle is in one instant, that is for one Planck second, part of a mass (counter-striking) and in the next instant it is energy again, so it is “radiating” into itself. However, the mass and radiation are nothing more than entering and leaving the counter-striking state.

Hawking [13] has expressed the opinion that a black hole cannot have a mass smaller than about  $10^{-5}$  gram, which interestingly is the same as the mass of half the Planck mass. However, the interpretation given here is very different. The term black hole is misleading if the formulas are actually hinting at the existence of an indivisible particle. The black hole interpretation for a particle with escape velocity  $c$  is just a hypothesis. The indivisible particle theory seems more logical and it also solves the mystery of why do we not observe anything with a Planck mass or close to a Planck mass, even when the Planck mass and the Planck length appear to be so important for certain parts of mathematical physics.

Hawking interpreted such mini-black holes as collapsed objects shown in the form of very densely packed masses due to very strong gravitation and a type of gravitational collapse. Under atomism, in contrast, this represents indivisible particles that cannot collapse or get any smaller; it is simply a mathematical expression of their indivisibility. Further, it is important to note that the indivisible particle has a spatial dimension; it is not a point particle. Compared to other masses, such as an electron that mostly consist of void, an indivisible particle is indeed very dense. When they are close of each other, these particles have an extremely strong force, namely the Planck force. However, this strong force only

lasts for a Planck second from an observers perspective, at the time when an indivisible particle counter-strikes with another indivisible particle. It is correct that any mass that we can observe in particle form, even in a thought experiment set-up, cannot have a mass of less than the Planck mass. This could happen if we strip a particle such as an electron of its void, that is if we “pushed” indivisible particles together. Alternatively, if we had equipment to observe the particles at close to a Planck second time interval, we would likely have observed Planck mass objects already and almost everywhere. Unfortunately, our current technology is very far from being able to measure such short time windows. Again the atomism theory seems fully consistent with the idea that there is something very special for particles with escape velocity  $c$ ; namely that these are very likely to be indivisible particles always traveling at speed  $c$ .

Another important point is that the view of energy and matter presented by atomism eliminates singularities, and, as we will soon see, it also gets rid of infinities. The appearance of singularities should typically be seen as an indication of model break down, but instead the purported detection of singularities has lead to a series of mystical interpretations such as black holes.

Figure 4 gives an illustration of the atomism interpretation of Schwarzschild radius and escape velocity at the Planck scale.




Figure 4: Illustration of Atomism interpretation of Schwarzschild radius and escape velocity at the Planck scale.

Four mathematically interesting Planck type particles, which are closely related to the Planck mass are listed in table 4. There are good reasons to think that only two of these particles actually represent something real: the Planck mass particle that consists of two indivisible particles and the most important of all particles, namely the indivisible particle, that has half the Planck mass.

Particle name	Mass in kg	Reduced Compton wavelength	Compton wavelength	Schwarzschild radius	Escape velocity <sup>a</sup>
	$m = \frac{l_p}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}$	$\bar{\lambda} = \frac{\hbar}{mc}$	$\lambda = \frac{\hbar}{mc} = \bar{\lambda} 2\pi$	$r_s = \frac{2Gm}{c^2}$	$v_e \sqrt{\frac{2Gm}{r}}$
Planck mass particle	$m_p \approx 2.177 \times 10^{-08}$	$l_p$	$l_p 2\pi$	$2l_p$	$\sqrt{2c}$ and $\frac{c}{\sqrt{\pi}}$
Planck type particle 1	$m_b = \sqrt{\pi} m_p$	$\frac{l_p}{\sqrt{\pi}}$	$2\sqrt{\pi} l_p$	$2\sqrt{\pi} l_p$	$\frac{c}{\sqrt{\pi}}$ and $c$
Planck type particle 2	$m_r = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} m_p$	$\sqrt{2} l_p$	$\sqrt{8\pi} l_p$	$\sqrt{2} l_p$	$c$ and $\frac{c}{\sqrt{2\pi}}$
Indivisible particle	$m_i = \frac{1}{2} m_p$	$l_p$ <sup>b</sup>	$n/a$	$l_p$	$c$

Table 4: Planck particles.

<sup>a</sup>The escape velocity is calculated twice, first by using the reduced Compton wavelength as the radius and second by using the Compton wavelength as the radius.

<sup>b</sup>This particle has per definition no Compton or reduced Compton wavelength of its own. This is the diameter of the particle. See comments below the table.

The indivisible particle has, by definition, no Compton or reduced Compton wavelength on its own. The indivisible particle does have an assumed diameter of  $l_p$ . In reality, to have a reduced Compton wavelength under our theory we need at a minimum two indivisible particles, as the reduced Compton wavelength in this theory is the average distance between two indivisible particles making up a mass. In a Planck mass, for example, the reduced Compton wavelength is  $l_p$ . Bear in mind that the indivisible

particle has no rest-mass except when counter-striking with another indivisible particle. When counter-striking with another indivisible particle, the two indivisible are combined the Planck mass and then this mass has a reduced Compton wavelength of  $l_p$  as also shown in the table. That is the distance center to center between two indivisible particles (that each have a diameter of  $l_p$ ) lying next to each other (counter-striking) for significantly longer than the Planck length.

## 6 A New Solution to Einstein's Infinite Mass Challenge

Let's look at relativistic masses next. Einstein [23, 45] gave the following relativistic mass formula:

$$\frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}. \quad (21)$$

Further, Einstein commented on his own formula

*This expression approaches infinity as the velocity  $v$  approaches the velocity of light  $c$ . The velocity must therefore always remain less than  $c$ , however great may be the energies used to produce the acceleration*<sup>8</sup>

We certainly agree with Einstein's formula; it is fully consistent and can also be derived from atomism, as shown by Haug in 2014. Einstein's argument is that the mass will become infinite as  $v$  approaches  $c$  and this means that we would need an infinite amount of energy to accelerate even an electron to the speed of light. However, from a deeper fundamental point of view the understanding of mass and energy in modern physics is still very limited. Based on a better understanding of quantization of mass and the Planck mass in particular, when rooted in atomism, we will show this leads to a "exact" speed limit for any given fundamental particle as long as we know the particle's rest-mass. At this maximum speed limit we will soon discuss, the subatomic particles will have reached a mass limit, which is the Planck mass. Next the Planck mass will dissolve more or less instantaneously into energy, which is moving at the speed of light. Here, we will not need infinite energy to move a mass to the speed of light.

Bear in mind that a Planck mass comes into existence exactly in the instant when two indivisible particles collide. Even if the indivisible particles creating the Planck mass are moving at the speed of light just before and after they collide (counter-strike), they are standing still in the very instant they create the mass. The Planck mass is simply a collision. One collision between two indivisible particles is one collision no matter what frame it is observed from. That is to say, the Planck mass is actually very unique in that it always has the same mass no matter what frame it is observed from. This is a special case, as it only holds for the Planck mass (the Planck mass particle that exist in the instant of the collision between two indivisible particles) and for no other subatomic particles.

Not only is the Planck mass invariant to what frame it is observed from; it must also be largest possible mass that a subatomic particle can take. Further, the Planck mass has the shortest possible reduced Compton wavelength. Its reduced Compton wavelength is equal to the Planck length. It is actually impossible for two indivisible particles to come closer towards each other when they counter-strike. They are indivisible and fully hard, just as the particles that Newton described. The indivisible particle has a diameter of  $l_p$  and the closest it can be between the two particles center to center is the Planck length, which again is the reduced Compton wavelength of the Planck mass, when the two indivisibles are lying side-by-side counter-striking. All known subatomic particles, such as an electron, have a much longer reduced Compton wavelength than the Planck mass. The indivisible particles making up an electron move back and forth along the reduced Compton wavelength of the electron. The shorter the reduced Compton wavelength of a particle, the larger the mass will be. The reduced Compton wavelength of any mass other than the Planck mass has mostly empty space (void) in the reduced Compton wavelength.

Assume two indivisible particles making up a rest-mass have a reduced Compton wavelength of  $\bar{\lambda}$ . Due to length contraction, when a mass is moving the reduced Compton wavelength of that mass will be observed as contracted from any other frame. This is the case at least as long as it is directly or indirectly measured with Einstein synchronized clocks; an extensive discussion and a series of derivations on this is given in [6]. When the speed of the subatomic particle is so large that the reduced Compton wavelength has length contracted to  $l_p$ , then the mass will simultaneously have reached its Planck mass. The Planck mass will however not be stable, but will, within a Planck second, burst into energy<sup>9</sup>. Well, the 'proof' is in the pudding, that is to say here, in the mathematical pudding<sup>10</sup>:

<sup>8</sup>This quote is taken from page 53 in the 1931 edition of Einstein's book *Relativity: The Special and General Theory*. English translation version of Einstein's book by Robert W. Lawson.

<sup>9</sup>Actually it will burst instantaneously into energy, but from an observer's perspective using Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks this would take place, under very idealized conditions, in one Planck second. This is actually due to a minimum synchronization error; see [6] for a discussion on clock synchronization errors.

<sup>10</sup>See an alternative derivation that gives the same end result in the Appendix A.





$$\begin{aligned}
E_{k,max} &= \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}} - mc^2 \\
E_{k,max} &= \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{\left(c\sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\bar{\lambda}^2}}\right)^2}{c^2}}} - mc^2 \\
E_{k,max} &= \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{c^2\left(1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\bar{\lambda}^2}\right)}{c^2}}} - mc^2 \\
E_{k,max} &= \frac{mc^2}{\frac{l_p}{\bar{\lambda}}} - mc^2 \\
E_{k,max} &= \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{l_p} mc^2 - mc^2 \\
E_{k,max} &= \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{l_p} \frac{\hbar}{\bar{\lambda}} \frac{1}{c} c^2 - \frac{\hbar}{\bar{\lambda}} \frac{1}{c} c^2 \\
E_{k,max} &= \frac{\hbar}{l_p} c - \frac{\hbar}{\bar{\lambda}} c \\
E_{k,max} &= \hbar c \left( \frac{1}{l_p} - \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}} \right) \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

Further, the energy in a Planck mass is  $E = m_p c^2 = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} c^2 = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} c$ . This means that subatomic fundamental particles must always have less kinetic energy than the Planck energy:

$$E_{k,max} = \hbar c \left( \frac{1}{l_p} - \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}} \right) < m_p c^2 \tag{25}$$

For any known particle, we see that  $\bar{\lambda} \gg l_p$ . This means that  $E_{k,max} \approx m_p c^2$ . In the special case where  $\bar{\lambda} = l_p$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
E_{k,max} &= \hbar c \left( \frac{1}{l_p} - \frac{1}{l_p} \right) \\
E_{k,max} &= 0 \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

That interpretation here is that a Planck mass likely cannot have kinetic energy. The Planck mass only exists for an instant<sup>15</sup> and then bursts into pure energy. This is also consistent with the maximum speed formula: for a reduced Compton wavelength equal to  $\bar{\lambda} = l_p$ , we obtain a speed limit of  $c$ . The indivisible particles making up the Planck mass always move at speed  $c$  and therefore have no kinetic energy; they are energy, but they are also the Planck mass in counter-strike. Particles with so-called rest-mass will acquire higher and higher kinetic energy as they accelerate; this continues until they reach their maximum speed and then become Planck masses that will burst into pure energy.

Atomism is wonderful in the way it removes infinities, such as infinity masses and infinite kinetic energy, as it gives well defined boundary conditions on these. We also notice that the absolute maximum kinetic energy given by this formula when the reduced Compton wavelength  $\bar{\lambda} = \infty$  is

$$E_{k,max} = \hbar c \left( \frac{1}{l_p} - \frac{1}{\infty} \right) = \hbar c \left( \frac{1}{l_p} - 0 \right) = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} c = E_p = m_p c^2 \tag{27}$$

Thus it is actually not kinetic energy (if we define kinetic energy for something still having mass while moving), but instead it is pure energy (with no rest mass). Recall that only the indivisibles that are not counter-striking have a reduced Compton wavelength of  $\infty$ . From atomist point of view, there is only Planck mass (that consist of half Planck potential mass indivisible particles) and Planck energy (non counter-striking indivisibles). All other energies and masses are simply a function of how often one switches back and forth between Planck mass and Planck energy. A heavier mass is related to a higher frequency of counter-strikes.

<sup>15</sup>The Planck mass actually only exist in an instant, but as hypothetically measure with Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks it will appear to last a Planck second, see [6] for an in detail discussion on clock synchronization.





seriously. This would be like ignoring special relativity theory before time dilation was confirmed years later, or ignoring general relativity before such things as light deflection close to the predictions of general relativity was confirmed in 1919. Even if we never could measure the maximum velocity, if such a theory deepens our insight and seems more logical than current theories then why should we hold on to the old theories without thinking more broadly around them?

What is more “irrational”: to assume there exists a well defined maximum velocity where masses will burst into energy or to assume, like modern physics, that this is simply not possible under any circumstances?

To extend the argument: assume we had a machine that could absorb the entire galaxy and turn it into pure energy. This energy could then be used efficiently to accelerate an electron. The current view of modern physics is that even this gigantic amount of energy would not be enough to accelerate an electron to the speed of light, as the prevailing view is that a truly infinite amount of energy would be needed, based on Einstein’s relativistic energy mass equation.

We also note that  $\bar{\lambda}\sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}} = l_p$  strongly indicates there is a maximum length contraction. Under atomism, the indivisible particle cannot contract, only the void space in between indivisible particles can be made shorter or longer by moving the indivisible particles closer toward each other. In a mass, the indivisible particles travel back and forth over the reduced Compton wavelength. When the indivisible particles lay side by side, their reduced Compton wavelength is the distance center to center between the indivisible particles. As they are indivisible and their diameter is  $l_p$ , then the center to center distance must also be  $l_p$  and this distance cannot get shorter, since we have abandoned the point particle hypothesis.

## 9 Relativistic Quantum Physics

Let’s define  $\beta = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}$ . This means we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \beta &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}} \\
 \beta &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{\left(c\sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2}}\right)^2}{c^2}} \\
 \beta &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{c^2\left(1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2}\right)}{c^2}} \\
 \beta &= \sqrt{1 - 1 + \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2}} \\
 \beta &= \sqrt{\frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2}} \\
 \beta &= \frac{l_p}{\lambda}
 \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

We can also see this relationship in the derivation of the maximum kinetic energy formula, and we will now illustrate how this leads to very neat relativistic quantum physics. Earlier in this paper and in other papers I have pointed out [50] that any uniform<sup>17</sup> mass can be expressed as

$$m = \frac{l_p}{\lambda} m_p \tag{30}$$

That is to say, in order to calculate the mass of an electron or to convert a Planck mass into an electron we simply multiply the Planck mass by  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda_e}$ . In fact, we could describe any fundamental particle mathematically as a function of the Planck mass in the following way

$$m = m_p \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}} = \frac{l_p}{\lambda} m_p = \frac{l_p}{\lambda} \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{\hbar}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c} \tag{31}$$

and to convert a non-Planck mass to a Planck mass we have

<sup>17</sup>With uniform I mean they have one reduced Compton wavelength. For example, the proton, if it truly consists of more fundamental particles like quarks, does not have one uniform reduced Compton wavelength.

$$m_p = \frac{m}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}} = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{l_p} m = \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{l_p} \frac{\hbar}{c} = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \quad (32)$$

In other words, relativistic quantum physics is very neat and simple; we can get a good grasp on the intuition behind the formulas once we understand the maximum speed of masses and the connection to atomism. Bear in mind that the Lorentz factor  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda}$  in our relativistic quantum physics has dimensionless output. For an electron, as an example, the Lorentz factor taken in relation to a Planck mass,  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda_e} \approx 4.1853210^{-23}$  will have the same dimensionless value no matter what metric system is used.

$$\frac{l_p}{\lambda} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}$$

Our new insight that  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}$  is directly related to relativistic quantum physics can give us deeper insight into the as-yet not fully understood formulas in modern physics. For instance, this gives us some new insight in the small gravitational coupling constant also known as the dimensionless gravitational coupling constant; see [51], [52], [53] and [54], for example. The gravitational coupling constant  $\alpha_G$  is defined as the gravitational force between a pair of electrons relative to that of two Planck masses and is normally given by

$$\alpha_G = \frac{Gm_e^2}{Gm_p^2} = \frac{Gm_e^2}{\hbar c} = \left(\frac{m_e}{m_p}\right)^2 \approx 1.7518 \times 10^{-45} \quad (33)$$

As shown by [55], the dimensionless gravitational coupling constant can be rewritten in the form

$$\alpha_G = \left(\frac{m_e}{m_p}\right)^2 = \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2} \quad (34)$$

and since  $\frac{l_p}{\lambda_e} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}$  this means

$$\alpha_G = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}} \quad (35)$$

where  $v_{max}$  is the maximum speed of the electron can take. At this speed we know an electron will turn into a Planck mass. In other words, the small gravitational coupling constant is simply a quantum relativistic relationship between two electron masses and two Planck masses; this has never been pointed out before to my knowledge.

This also means that the Newtonian gravity between two electron-size masses is linked to the gravity between two Planck masses in the following way

$$F = G \frac{m_p \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}} m_p \sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}}{r^2} = G \frac{m_p m_p}{r^2} \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_e^2} = G \frac{m_e m_e}{r^2} \quad (36)$$

where  $v_{max} = c \sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p}{\lambda_e}}$ . This means we also have

$$F = G \frac{\frac{m_e}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}} \frac{m_e}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v_{max}^2}{c^2}}}}{r^2} = G \frac{m_e m_e}{r^2} \frac{\bar{\lambda}_e^2}{l_p^2} = G \frac{m_p m_p}{r^2} \quad (37)$$

Thus, atomism leads us to some sort of relativistic Newtonian gravity without using general relativity. We can naturally do the same for other masses simply by using the corresponding maximum velocity<sup>18</sup> given for that mass. The gravitational coupling constant is indeed a quantum relativistic adjustment between the electrons and the Planck masses. The clue to understanding this is to grasp that the Planck mass consists of two indivisible particles counter-striking and that these indivisible particles always travel at the speed of light. Hopefully this can open new pathways for unifying gravity with the quantum realm.

## 10 Summary and Conclusion

The Planck mass plays an important role in a series of mathematical calculations and analysis in modern physics. The Planck mass is enormous compared to the mass of any known subatomic particle and still its reduced Compton wavelength is much smaller than any known subatomic particle. It has been speculated that Planck mass size particles are related to mini-black holes. Here we have introduced a totally new interpretation of matter and energy. In 2014, Haug has shown that all mathematical end results from

<sup>18</sup>That is given by the reduced Compton wavelength of that mass.

special relativity can be derived from atomism. However, he had not shown how his theory could be linked to known subatomic particles.

Here we show that the indivisible particle, if having a potential mass equal to half the Planck mass, basically can explain the mass of any other subatomic particle. Based on this observation, we claim that we have found the Planck mass particle. We even claim that it cannot be found directly in a particle accelerator such as the Large Hadron Collider. The only way to find the Planck mass particle is through the intellect.

Atomism also provides a more logical interpretation of the Heisenberg Uncertainty principle than the interpretation given by modern quantum mechanics. Further, we develop a completely new interpretation of the Schwarzschild radius at the Planck scale. When the Schwarzschild radius is  $l_p$ , it fits the interpretation of an indivisible particle always traveling at the speed of light perfectly. In other words, there are really no mini-black holes. Still, the indivisible particle has many similarities with some of the ideas about black holes. Nothing can escape or enter an indivisible particle because it has no parts and is a singular particle with spatial-dimension. This new view of matter and energy also gives a new solution to Einstein's infinite mass problem. While Einstein solved it by assuming that no mass can be accelerated to the speed of light, as this would require infinite energy, we show that all subatomic particles have a maximum speed limit just below the speed of light where they will first turn into Planck masses. The Planck mass is extremely unstable and will instantaneously burst into energy. The amount of energy needed to accelerate any subatomic fundamental particle to its maximum speed is the Planck mass energy. This energy is substantially higher than what one is operating at with the Large Hadron Collider. So with today's particle accelerators we are far away from being able to test this out experimentally. Still, it gives a totally new and interesting view on matter and energy.

One of the main contributions from atomism seems to be that we can eliminate singularities and infinities without changing known equations. Atomism, with its focus on an indivisible particle, seems to bring back logic and simplicity to the interpretations of well-known existing formulas. Singularities and infinities have traditionally been viewed as an indication for model break down or incompleteness, but in modern physics they have often been accepted and instead of leading to questions about the models, have led to all sorts of mystical interpretations that have lured physics away from logic and strict scientific principles.

It is high time to abandon the point-particle idea and to rethink the particle-wave duality – for this we must investigate atomism further. We end this paper on a light note with a citation from Einstein

*'Pions, pions! Ach, vee don't understand de electron! Vy bother mit pions? – Albert Einstein to Leon Lederman (about 1950)*

## Appendix A

In this appendix we show a slightly different way of deriving the maximum speed for particles. The end result is the same as the derivation elsewhere in the paper.

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_p &= \frac{m}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} \\
 \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} &= \frac{m}{m_p} \\
 \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} &= \frac{\frac{l_p}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}} \\
 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} &= \frac{\left(\frac{l_p}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}\right)^2}{\sqrt{\frac{\hbar c}{G}}^2} \\
 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} &= \frac{\frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2} \frac{\hbar c}{G}}{\frac{\hbar c}{G}} \\
 v &= c \sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2}} \tag{38}
 \end{aligned}$$

## Appendix B

When we think of mass in kg then the maximum mass for a fundamental particle is  $m_p = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c}$ , and the equivalent time-speed of the Planck mass is  $\hat{m}_p = \frac{l_p}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c} = \frac{1}{c}$ . Based on this we can calculate the maximum speed of a fundamental particle:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \hat{m}_p &= \frac{\hat{m}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} \\
 \frac{1}{c} &= \frac{\frac{l_p}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c}}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} \\
 \frac{1}{c} \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} &= \frac{l_p}{\lambda} \frac{1}{c} \\
 \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} &= \frac{l_p}{\lambda} \\
 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2} &= \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2} \\
 v &= \sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda^2}}
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

This is the same maximum speed as derived from looking at masses as kg rather than time-speed, the two different notations of mass are closely connected, where time-speed can be seen as the more fundamental one. To understand the concept of time-speed in detail see [6].

## References

- [1] E. Schrödinger. *Nature and the Greeks and Science and Humanism*. Cambridge University Press, 1954.
- [2] W. K. C. Guthrie. *The Pre-Socratic Tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*. Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- [3] A. Pyle. *Atomism and it's Critics*. Bristol, Thoemmes Press, 1995.
- [4] C. Taylor. *The Atomists: Leucippus and Democritus: Fragments and Translation with Commentary*. University of Toronto Press, 1999.
- [5] W. Scott. *The Conflict between Atomism and Conservation Theory 1644 to 1860*. Elsevier, New York, 1970.
- [6] E. G. Haug. *Unified Revolution: New Fundamental Physics*. Oslo, E.G.H. Publishing, 2014.
- [7] M. Planck. *The Theory of Radiation*. Dover 1959 translation, 1906.
- [8] L. Motz. Gauge invariance and the structure of charged particles. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, 26(4), 1962.
- [9] L. Motz. A gravitational theory of the mu meson and leptons in general. *Rutherford Observatory, Columbia University*, 1966.
- [10] L. Motz. The quantization of mass. *Rutherford Observatory, Columbia University*, 1971.
- [11] M. Markov. Elementary particles of maximally large masses (quarks and maximons). *Soviet Physics JPT*, 24(3), 1967.
- [12] S. S. De. Quantum creation of highly massive particles in the very early universe. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 2001.
- [13] S. Hawking. Gravitationally collapsed objects of very low mass. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 152, 1971.
- [14] L. Motz and J. Epstein. The gravitational charge  $1/2\sqrt{\hbar c}$  as a unifying principle in physics. *Il Nuovo Cimento*, 51(1), 1979.

- [15] G. M. Obermair. Primordial Planck mass black holes (ppmbhs) as candidates for dark matter? *Journal of Physics, Conference Series*, 442, 2013.
- [16] J. H. Macgibbon. Can Planck-mass relics of evaporating black holes close the universe? *Nature*, 329, 1987.
- [17] V. Dokuchaev and Y. N. Eroshenko. Black hole atom as a dark matter particle candidate. *Advances in High Energy Physics*, 2014.
- [18] S. J. Crothers and J. Dunning-Davies. Planck particles and quantum gravity. *Progress in Physics*, 3, 2006.
- [19] E. G. Haug. The gravitational constant and the Planck units: A deeper understanding of the quantum realm. *www.vixra.org 1603.0207*, 2016.
- [20] E. G. Haug. Unification of gravity and electromagnetism: Gravityelectromagnetism: A probability interpretation of gravity. *www.vixra.org*, 2016.
- [21] A. Einstein. On the electrodynamics of moving bodies. *Annalen der Physik, English translation by George Barker Jeffery 1923*, (17), 1905.
- [22] A. Einstein. Zur elektrodynamik bewegter körper. *Annalen der Physik*, (17), 1905.
- [23] A. Einstein. Ist die trägheit eines körpers von seinem energieinhalt abhängig? *Annalen der Physik*, 323(13):639–641, 1905.
- [24] L. Mayants. On probability theory and probabilistic physics – axiomatics and methodology. *Foundations of Physics*, 3.
- [25] L. Mayants. *The Enigma of Probability and Physics*. Fundamental Theories of Physics, Springer, 1984.
- [26] L. Mayants. Quantum physics as a particular domain of probabilistic physics. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 33.
- [27] E. Panarella. Nonlinear behaviour of light at very low intensities: The “photon clump” model. *NATO Science Series: B: Advanced Science Institutes Series*, 162, 1987.
- [28] J. Dunning-Davies and R. L. Norman. The enigma that is light. <http://vixra.org/abs/1606.0206>, 2016.
- [29] J. Fröhlich, A. Knowles, and A. Pizzo. Atomism and quantization. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 40(12):193–209, 2007.
- [30] J. J. Larmor. On the theory of the magnetic influence on spectra; and the radiation from moving ions. *Philosophical Magazine*, 5(271), 1897.
- [31] E. G. Haug. Gravity and static electricity: The same force at the Planck scale? *www.vixra.org April 12 2016*, 2016.
- [32] E. G. Haug. *Double Light Speed: History, Confusion and Recent Applications*. Working paper first posted at [www.espenhaug.com](http://www.espenhaug.com), 2015.
- [33] E. G. Haug. Planck quantization of Newton and Einstein gravitation. *International Journal of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 6.
- [34] V. R. D’Angelo. The 13/12 schematic of thirteen fundamental constants and their twelve respective ratios, that give rise to all constants. <http://vixra.org/pdf/1607.0172v1.pdf>, 2016.
- [35] W. Heisenberg. Über den anschaulichen inhalt der quantentheoretischen kinematik und mechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, (43):172–198, 1927.
- [36] K. Schwarzschild. über das gravitationsfeld einer kugel aus inkompressibler flüssigkeit nach der einsteinschen theorie. *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Mathematik, Physik, und Technik*, page 424, 1916.
- [37] K. Schwarzschild. Über das gravitationsfeld eines massenpunktes nach der einsteinschen theorie. *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Mathematik, Physik, und Technik*, page 189, 1916.

- [38] D. Hilbert. *Nachr. ges. wiss. Göttingen, Math. Phys. (Submitted 23 Dec. 1916)*, 1917.
- [39] S. Antoci. David Hilbert and the origin of the “Schwarzschild solution”. *www.arXiv:physics/0310104*.
- [40] S. J. Crothers. A brief history of black holes. *Progress in Physics*, 2, 2006.
- [41] E. G. Haug. Planck dimensional analysis of big G. *www.vixra.org*, 2016.
- [42] J. Michell. On the means of discovering the distance, magnitude, c. of the fixed stars, in consequence of the diminution of the velocity of their light. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 74, 1784.
- [43] J. Dunning-Davies. Questions concerning Schwarzschild’s solution of Einstein’s equations. *www.arXiv:physics/0503095, year = 2005,*.
- [44] A. T. Augousti and A. Radosz. An observation on the congruence of the escape velocity in classical mechanics and general relativity in a Schwarzschild metric. *European Journal of Physics*, 376:331–335, 2006.
- [45] A. Einstein. *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*. Translation by Robert Lawson (1931), Crown Publishers, 1916.
- [46] B. Fixler, G. T. Foster, J. M. McGuirk, and M. A. Kasevich. Atom interferometer measurement of the Newtonian constant of gravity. *Science*, 315, 2007.
- [47] S. Schlamminger. A fundamental constants: A cool way to measure big G. *Nature*, 510, 2014.
- [48] G. Brumfiel. LHC by the numbers. *News: Briefing, Nature, Published online 9 September*, 2008.
- [49] J. Gravesande, Willem. *Mathematical Elements of Physicks, prov’d by Experiments: Being an Introduction to Sir Isaac Newton’s Philosophy... Made English, and illustrated with 33 copper-plates, Revis’d and corrected, by Dr. John Keill*. London, 1720.
- [50] E. G. Haug. Simplification of the Klein–Gordon equation. *http://vixra.org/abs/1604.0362*, 2016.
- [51] J. Silk. Cosmogony and the magnitude of the dimensionless gravitational coupling constant. *Nature*, 265:710–711, 1977.
- [52] I. L. Rozental. On the numerical values of the fine-structure constant and the gravitational constant. *Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics Letters*, 31(9):19–27, 1980.
- [53] M. d. O. Neto. Using the dimensionless Newton gravity constant  $\bar{\alpha}_g$  to estimate planetary orbits. *Chaos, Solitons and Fractals*, 24(1):19–27, 2005.
- [54] A. S. Burrows and J. P. Ostriker. Astronomical reach of fundamental physics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(7):31–36, 2013.
- [55] E. G. Haug. A note on the dimensionless gravitational coupling constant. *http://vixra.org/abs/1604.0198*, 2016.