

# **Monkeys do not die as lizards**

**or how to stop the madness of contemporary physics**

Peter Paul Schuttevaar

August 29, 2022



# Dedication

This work is dedicated to all people who keep seeking for the truth in the midst of the mountains of misinformation and misconceptions of modernity.



# Copyright



Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)



# Acknowledgements

I would like to thank professor Peter van Hoesel for his heartfelt encouragements, professor Jan van der Berg, professor Dennis Dieks, Peter Jackson and professor Henk Koppelaar for their first feedback on the scientific content, dr M. van Selm for her careful redaction of the English texts. Last but not least, i am grateful for the help of my son Vincent in evaluating the scientific virtues of the BPO theory.

Cover design is by Annemiek van Kerkhof-Posthuma.





# Contents

Dedication	i
Copyright	iii
Acknowledgements	v
<b>1. introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. mathematical formalisms posing as physical theories</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1. a guiding rule for discerning precision from empirical accuracy . . .	9
2.2. how mathematics is isolated from ontology . . . . .	11
2.3. a claim of extraordinary precision . . . . .	20
2.4. a simple, empirical accurate alternative . . . . .	22
2.5. further considerations . . . . .	25
2.6. conclusion . . . . .	26
<b>3. how modern spatial and temporal topologies hinder universality</b>	<b>27</b>
3.1. a more precise problem description . . . . .	28
3.2. a first systematization . . . . .	28
3.3. pragmatic considerations and universality . . . . .	31
3.4. conclusion . . . . .	33
<b>4. QM as the emperor without clothes</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1. on polarization . . . . .	35
4.1.1. a new definition for polarization . . . . .	36
4.1.2. mathematical formalization . . . . .	38
4.1.3. on Bell's inequality and entanglement . . . . .	40
4.1.4. follow up . . . . .	43
4.2. on entanglement . . . . .	43
4.2.1. another example of RMET . . . . .	45
4.2.2. electric induction, an insufficient concept . . . . .	46
4.2.3. a causal reversal of force and motion . . . . .	47
4.2.4. on entanglement in quantum mechanics . . . . .	49
4.2.5. an alternative definition of entanglement . . . . .	51
4.3. implications . . . . .	51

<b>5. how to validate a basic theory</b>	<b>53</b>
5.1. an example of theory intertwined with experiment . . . . .	53
5.2. a framework for evaluating experimental evidence . . . . .	54
5.3. putting our framework into practice . . . . .	56
5.4. summation . . . . .	60
5.5. conclusion . . . . .	61
<b>6. intrinsic speed, the pink elephant in the QM and SM room</b>	<b>63</b>
6.1. a conceptual barrier between energy and mass . . . . .	64
6.2. definitions . . . . .	65
6.3. mass versus inertia and energy . . . . .	66
6.4. feasibility of the BPO in six challenges . . . . .	67
6.5. which problems are addressed? . . . . .	70
6.6. conclusion . . . . .	71
<b>7. the BPO theory</b>	<b>73</b>
7.1. first challenge: a limited set of attributes for a basic object . . . . .	73
7.2. second challenge: a simple basic interaction law . . . . .	74
7.3. third challenge: patterns of motion as stable particles of nature . . . . .	78
7.3.1. merging and splitting of Bp's . . . . .	88
7.4. fourth challenge: a fundamental asymmetry in particles . . . . .	88
7.5. fifth challenge: forces of nature emerge from the basic interaction . . . . .	91
7.5.1. using the electrostatic force to calibrate basic velocity and basic mutuality . . . . .	95
7.6. sixth challenge: preliminary atomic model. . . . .	98
7.7. conclusion . . . . .	102
<b>8. other scientific virtues of BPO</b>	<b>103</b>
8.1. a novel conceptual Framework . . . . .	103
8.1.1. Particle structure and behavior . . . . .	105
8.1.2. Beyond the particle . . . . .	108
8.2. External Consistency . . . . .	110
8.3. Empirical Accuracy . . . . .	111
8.4. Predictive fertility . . . . .	114
<b>9. what now?</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>A. methodological considerations</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>B. calculations</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>More about the author</b>	<b>131</b>

# List of Figures

4.1. an electromagnetic wave . . . . .	36
4.2. polarization angles in eight sections . . . . .	37
4.3. a typical polarization setup . . . . .	38
7.1. 3D picture of dynamic interaction between two charged objects. . .	75
7.2. a neutral particle . . . . .	79
7.3. charged particles . . . . .	81
7.4. linear polarization of a photon . . . . .	82
7.5. circular polarization of a photon . . . . .	83
7.6. two moving charges . . . . .	92
7.7. spatial orientations of two particles . . . . .	99



# List of Tables

2.1. Gyro-factors against reference values . . . . .	25
7.1. relative strength of interaction related to spatial orientation. . . . .	99
8.1. Calculated Diameters of particles against reference values . . . . .	113
8.2. Gyro Magnetic Ratios of some stable particles and anti-particles . .	114
8.3. Magnetic moments against their reference values . . . . .	115



# 1. introduction

Yes, this book is about physics. So then why is the title about lizards and monkeys? That is because this book is also about absurdity and about a kind of madness that I want to take head on. Let me explain.

Suppose we live in a nice midsize town somewhere in a tropical climate. There is a vast forest nearby. It is so impenetrable that not a single human being has visited it for ages. Life at this far out place is pleasant and rather uneventful. Tranquility is almost complete, but for some loud noises coming from the forest now and then. We recognize those as the sound of monkeys. From time to time, these noises are so loud and aggressive that we suspect that groups of monkeys are engaged in warfare. And like it is in warfare, individuals get killed. Therefore, we become curious and want to know for sure if monkeys are killed in these clashes. But we do not dare to go into the woods, as we perceive them as hostile and dangerous. So we find another solution to satisfy our curiosity. We install some detectors alongside the forest, able to pick up the faintest odors. These detectors detect any molecule with a fragrance. And so they can also detect that blood has flowed or that a carcass is decaying.

During the next months, we detect many noises of clashing monkeys and do a lot of odor measurements. Since this is a scientific book, let us call these monkey sounds our Input Events (IE) since those are what started our investigations and let us call the odor measurements our Output Events (OE). The trick of science is to find a relation between input and output events. Normally there would be a natural law, connecting input and output event. In this case, we already have a sort of law, stating that monkeys die during clashes and we are looking for output events that match this theoretical construct. Let us call our train of thought, connecting input and output events, our *theoretical bridge*.

Unfortunately, we fail to detect the odor of dead monkeys as output events. There is simply not a single molecule of a dead monkey carcass being picked up by our detectors. Since we hear such incredible loud noises, we are not prepared to let go of the assumption that individual monkeys must get killed. We start to suspect that something fishy is going on. So we start to do some serious theorizing. A lot of ideas are put forward in order to build a new theoretical bridge. One of the many proposed