Chadwick's Neutron Mistake

The mathematical proof of the non existence of the neutron

By Professor Joe Nahhas 1979

Abstract: Charge is lost like in pair annihilations and gained like in 1932 Chadwick's Neutron discovery experiment as if charge is a hat we can wear or hang it for a while. This sort of loss or gain of a property based on motion can not be a physical property but more like motion geometry. In this paper I discuss James Chadwick experiment and will show that the neutron is the same as the proton. Meaning the neutron and the proton are the same particle with the same mass.

Introduction: I taught in colleges for few years and can I can explain it: it is called **Scatter.** If you been in a nuclear lab you have these samples of radioactive material bombarding a Geiger counter. Not every one hit on the Geiger count one hit. Geiger counter has no means of telling if he got hit once or twice in a single spot. Radioactivity is not a clock timed emission but a sporadic behavior. The difference between the total mass and the counted mass is the scattered mass divided by the number of the Geiger count give average lost mass per proton when added to the proton mass it was claimed as the neutron mass

What you have is like this: Assume you have 100 protons each ways 2 grams and total mass is 200. But you did not know that. You only know that you have 200 grams of radioactive material and used the Geiger counter because unless you count it you will never know how much you had. At the beginning you can only know the total mass you lose five protons and you counted 95 protons two grams each you are saying
I had 200 grams now I have a count of 95 protons two grams each
Then an energy loss of ten grams had happened
10 divided by 95 = 0.105 grams per proton mass loss
So each proton is 2 grams and a loss of energy of 0.105
Then there must be a Neutron that ways 2.105

Proof: Proof: An Alpha α bombarded Beryllium Be.
Or α ------------------------> Be ---------------------> N (0) m (p)

These particles go through diffraction and then through Paraffin which is a Wax with high thermo absorption that suck these high speed particles and becomes very dark carbon.
N (0) m (p) suffered scatter and approximated as decay
And the new number of protons is:

$N\ m\ (p) = N\ (0)\ m\ (p)\ Exp\ (-\lambda t)$ decay to count the new number

$N\ m\ (p) = N\ (0)\ m\ (p)\ Exp\ [1 - \lambda t]$
$= N\ (0)\ m\ (p) - N\ (0)\ m\ (p)\ \lambda t$

$N = N\ (0) - N\ (0)\ \lambda t = N\ (0) - d N$
Or $N\ (0) = N + d N$; $d N = - N\ (0)\ t/ T$; T is the life time of the radioactive sample.

So, $N = N\ (0) - N\ (0)\ t/ T = N\ (0)\ [1 - t/T]$ the number of particles changed
Or we lose N (0) /T particles every t/T seconds
What Chadwick did or his mistake is:
$N / N\ (0) = [1 - t/T]$
No Loss of particles but loss of mass in each particle m (0) t/ T in T time
This mass of particle is m (0) = Proposed Neutron and m = m (p)

Instead of using $N / N\ (0) = [1 - t/T]$
Chadwick used $m\ (p) = m\ (0)\ [1 - t/T]$

And $m\ (0) = m\ (p) / [1 - t/T]$

With $t/T \approx 1/T$; $\lambda = 1/ T$; T = 726.2390 seconds or little over 12 minutes 1979 data
And m (p) = 1836.12 m (e)

And said there must be a Neutron
Or mass of Neutron Ghost $m\ (n) = m\ (p) / [1 - t/T] = 1838.6511\ m\ (e)$

Conclusion: Average decay per proton m (p)/ T = 2.528258604 m (e) lost mass due to decay. When added to m (p) that is $m\ (p) + m\ (p)/T \neq m\ (n) = 1838.6511\ m\ (e)$

And $\sum 1838.65\ m\ (e) = \sum 1836.12\ m\ (e) + \sum 2.53\ m\ (e)$

Initial number of protons = Geiger counted protons + scattered protons
The assumption that there is a Neutron inside the nucleus is wrong.

 joenahhas1958@yahoo.com