NEUTRON NEW MODEL

Antonio PUCCINI

Neurophysiologist of Health Ministry, Naples - Italy

ABSTRACT

Initially the neutron (*N*) was considered made by the very close union of a proton (*P*) and an electron (e^-), i.e. a *doublet*: 〔P, e^-〕. This is the *electron capture* process, which involves also an electronic neutrino (ν_e): $e^- + P \rightarrow N + \nu_e$.
This *neutronization* reaction occurs continuously in reality: in the Neutron Stars, or in the stellar and explosive nucleosynthesis, creating all the elements of the *Periodic Table*.
Later it was found that some principles of Quantum Mechanics did not allow the presence of e^- in the nucleus, since e^- acquiring an energy of ~140 MeV immediately goes away.
However, it was not considered that the *electron capture* occurs just because the e^- involved is provided with a relativistic energy: ~200 MeV. This explains why this bond lasts for hundreds of millions of years, as in the Neutron Stars. Then it emerged that the *Spin Statistics* categorically imposed that the N was a fermion, rather than a boson (if it was a *doublet*).
However, if we considered the *N* as a *multiplet*, made of 3 particles with half-integer spin, the *N* would continue to be a fermion safeguarding, likewise, the *Spin Statistics* and making exhaustive and much more congruous the *electron capture* equation.
It is therefore necessary to integrate the *photoannihilation* processes ($\gamma \rightarrow \nu_e + \bar{\upsilon}_e$) to the *neutronization*, so that: $e^- + P + \gamma \rightarrow e^- + P + \bar{\upsilon}_e + \nu_e \rightarrow N + \nu_e$; as we can see, *N* is equivalent to the *multiplet* [e^-, *P*, $\bar{\upsilon}_e$]. However, the *N decay* ($N \rightarrow P + e^- + \bar{\upsilon}_e$) is energetically *unbalanced*, since the mass of a $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ is ≤ 5.8eV, against an *energy gap* between 0.7828-0.511MeV.
The only possible solution to solve this striking *mass gap problem* could be given by a possible neutral electron (e°), or rather its anti-particle: the ē°. Thus the *N multiplet* (or *neutral compound P*) would be balanced too: *N* = [e^-, *P*, ē°].

1. INTRODUCTION

As it is known, the discovery of the neutron (*N*) is ultimately due to the experimental research carried out at the Cavendish laboratory in Cambridge, started by Rutherford and completed by his pupil Chadwick.

1.1. THE NEUTRON HUNTING

Rutherford was troubled by the possible structure of the atom and by the concept that the atomic nucleus should also reveal the presence of neutral, massive particles. In his "Bakerian Lecture" (1920), Rutherford hypothesized that, within a nucleus, there could be one or more "very strong electron-proton combinations"[1], while at the same time persisting the possibility of coexistence in the nucleus of a number of protons (*P*s) exactly equivalent to the number of atomic, peripheral electrons, orbiting at enormous distances from the nucleus [1]. On the other hand, the presence of electrons (e^{-}_{s}) inside the nucleus was not an abstruse concept. Rutherford referred to the experiments of Becquerel, who as early as 1896 had demonstrated, unequivocally, that some atomic nuclei (Uranium salts) emit e^{-}_{s} of high energy, called *β rays* [2]. From that time, therefore, we start thinking of nuclei compound of *P*s and e^{-}_{s} , i.e. *nuclear electrons* [3]. Rutherford added that, since the atom was hydrogen (H) neutral, considered as a nucleus of single unit charge (a *P*, in this case), having a e^{-} attached at a certain distance, it was possible that an e^{-} would combine very much strictly with a hydrogen nucleus, H_1^1 (as to say a *P*), forming a sort of *neutral doublet* 〔*P, e*⁻〕. Rutherford stated in this regard: " Under some conditions it may be possible for an e^{-} to combine much more closely with the H nucleus, forming a kind of *neutral doublet*. Such an atom would have very novel properties. Its external field would be practically zero, except very close to the nucleus, and in consequence it should be able to move freely through matter"[1]. In this context, under conditions of very high density (as the nuclear matter, equal to 10^{13}g/cm^3), it may turn out that the e^{-}_{s}, subjected in addition to intense forces, may appear deformed, so as to remain tied, *trapped* in the nucleus. The following month, at the British Association Meeting of 25/8/1920, Rutherford called this *neutral doublet* with the term "neutron" [4].

Also two other authors, in those years, had proposed the existence of nuclear "neutral systems". Van den Broek had hypothesized that the atomic number (Z) was equal to half the atomic mass (A) and that it was equal to the number of e^- orbiting around the nucleus [5]. So Van den Broek proposed the possibility that there might be e^-_s inside the nucleus (positively charged). Later A. suggested that next to the load nucleus there was a group of neutral particles consisting in the combination of a α particle with 2 e^-, giving rise to radioactivity [6]. Van den Broek wrote that the atomic nucleus could be made of an even number of α particles and of H nuclei, which, together with the e^-_s (or *β rays*), made "compound systems" [7].

In 1920, in turn, Harkins hypothesized that the combination of 2 H nuclei (like 2 *P*s) with 2 e^- represented an important constituent of atomic nuclei, especially of the heavier ones. Basically when describing the structure of the nuclei, the US chemist uses different groups of particles: he considers groups μ formed by 2 *P*s and 2 e^- $(\eta_2^+,\beta_2^-)^0$, or the particle υ with mass 3, containing 3 *P*s and 2 e^- $(\eta_3^+,\beta_2^-)^+$ [8]. In the nucleus the so-called *helio group* plays a play maker role: $(\eta_4^+,\beta_2^-)^0$, consisting of a particle α, denoted by η_4^+, that is positively charged, which is electrically neutralized by 2 «*cementing electrons*», indicated by β_2^- [8]. The Author specifies: "It is not improbable that some isotopic atoms are formed by the addition of the group (η^+, β^-)" [8]. Harkins gives no name to this additional group, which, however, has many similarities with the *neutron* (*N*) of which Rutherford will speak a few weeks later [4] [9]. Likewise, it is clear the close resemblance of the *Harkins nuclear helio group* (with its *cementing electrons*), if compared with the *neutral satellite*, located within the atomic nucleus, discussed by Rutherford in 1927 [9] [10]. Harkins, in essence, proposed a close combination between *P* and e^- within the atomic nuclei, where the *helio group* would play a significant role. In that period, in short, it was developing the idea that the atomic nucleus was constituted only by *Ps* and e^-_s [11]. In fact, the conception that the nucleus contained

e^-_s had been affirmed thanks to the contribution of Marie Curie and Bohr, in relation to the *β* radioactive phenomena. Scientists believed that the e^-_s expelled had to pre-exist some part, in the atom, or in the nucleus. On the other hand, while it was possible to operate on the orbital e^-_s, it was not for the e^-_s issued in the *N decay*, or *negative β-decay* (*βd*⁻) [9].

Rutherford continued through the first 20 years of the last century with his experiments in search of the *N*, involving also the student Chadwick.

In 1930, in Berlin, Bothe and Becker showed a highly penetrating *radiation*, capable of crossing a 20 cm thick lead wall. The theory predicted that, by bombarding a substance with α particles, a photon and a *P*, called first Radiation [11] should be formed. Bothe and Becker, on the other hand, found that an unknown radiation was emitted, with a greater energy both of the incident α particles and of the energy of the γ rays emitted. It was a penetrating, highly energetic, and *neutral* radiation, as it was not deflected by electro-magnetic fields. The two authors called it the second radiation: it could make one think of an energetic radiation γ [12].

These experiments were tried again at the Cavendish of Cambridge (the same laboratories where Rutherford and Chadwick operated), where in 1932 Webster was surprised to find that the emitted radiation was excessively penetrating, and had considerable energy, which could not be attributed to a γ ray emerging from those experiments [13]. Webster questioned it could be about electro-magnetic radiation (EMR), but of material particles. So, at first Webster suggested it could be *fast corpuscles*: that is, 1 *P* and 1 e^- strictly connected. However, exams and subsequent results made him change his mind [14]. At the same time, in Paris, the Joliot-Curie spouses, reproducing similar experiments, showed that if the mysterious radiation hit paraffin, or other substances containing H, induced the emission of accelerated *P*s, highly energetic. Photons γ would have never had enough energy to expel *P*s from matter; therefore they called it "The third Radiation", convinced that they had discovered a new form of *interaction*, operating between radiation and matter [15].

Chadwick, on the contrary, considered untenable that the mysterious radiation was made up of photons! In essence Chadwick suspected that both the Parisian couple, both Webster, and Bothe and Becker, without realizing it, had "stumbled" [11] into a neutral and massive particle: the *N* hypothesized by his *master* Rutherford, and Harkins.

The same opinion was also given by Ettore Majorana who, as Amaldi recounts, as soon as he read the Joliot-Curie article and their interpretation, he exclaimed to his colleagues in *Via Panisperna*: "They did not understand anything; probably they are *P*s of recoil produced by a *heavy neutral particle* "[16]. Besides Amaldi was also present, among others, Segré, who reports that Majorana "immediately understood that there was what he called a *neutral proton*" [17].

1.2. THE NEUTRON DISCOVERY

At this point, Chadwick, in collaboration with Dr Feather, reproduced the experiments of the Parisian spouses, that is he bombarded a beryllium disk (Be_4^9) with α particles (He_2^4) emitted by a polonium disk (with a plate of paraffin in between), finding that the acceleration suffered by the *P*s emitted unequivocally denoted an energy 4 times greater than if they were affected by γ photons [11]. Therefore, Chadwick concluded that the *P*s, emitted in the experiment, had not been hit by an EMR, but by a new corpuscle, the *Neutron* (N_0^1), i.e. a massive and neutral particle, represented by a combination of 1 e⁻ with 1 *P*, like a dipole, provided with a mass slightly higher than that of *P*:

$$He_2^4 + Be_4^9 \rightarrow C_6^{12} + N_0^1 \quad (1).$$

The deductive reasoning followed by Chadwick was extraordinarily linear and logical. Thanks to it, He succeeded in solving the enigma. "*Logically* - so Chadwick reasoned - the *P*s are made rapidly moving by a particle with a mass similar to theirs. According to an elementary notion of Mechanics, well known, the energy that transfers in a collision is maximum when the colliding particles have the same mass: a typical example is that of two billiard balls "[18].

In February 1932, Chadwick sent a letter to the editor of Nature entitled "Possible Existence of a Neutron" [19] and, 3 months later, his experiments were published in the Proccedings of the Royal Society of London where, in describing the N, points out: "We may suppose it to consist of a *P* and an e^- in close combination. We may then proceed to build up nuclei out of α-particles, *N*s and *P*s, and we are able to avoid the presence of uncombined e^-_s in a nucleus. This has certain advantages for, as is well known, the e^-_s in a nucleus have lost some of the properties which they have outside, e.g., their spin and magnetic moment. It has so far been assumed that the *N* is a complex particle consisting of a *P* and an e^-. This is the simplest assumption"[20].

2. DISCUSSION

2.1. MAJORANA' S NEUTRAL PROTON

The "3rd Radiation" which Joliot-Curies thought they had discovered [15], for Majorana is nothing but a "*neutral proton*" [17], shortly thereafter referred to by Chadwick as "neutron" (*N*) [19] [20]. At the time the enigma of how more *P*s could coexist, and now also *N*s, inside the atomic nucleus, despite the repulsive Coulomb's forces, was still unsolved. The solution was first proposed by Majorana, "at the beginning of 1932" [21], proposing the existence of "*exchange forces*" between *P* and *P*, as well as between *P* and *neutral P*, or between 2 *neutral P*s, operating in the nucleus. As reposted both by Fermi and his *Via Panisperna's boys*, Majorana had always been reticent to publish his intuitions: very often he found a solution to a problem, he wrote it on a pack of cigarettes and communicated it to his colleagues, often after exposing it to the blackboard, then he threw away the package (with all equations) [16].

Fermi found very interesting this idea of "*exchange forces*", so he asked his disciple Majorana for permission to publish it, but received a clear denial [16] [17]. In fact, "Prior to the official announcement of Chadwick's discovery of the *N*, Majorana is able to explain the structure and stability of atomic nuclei" [21] mediated by the *neutral P*s and *exchange forces*. Majorana also anticipates the pioneering work of Ivanenko [22], but does not want to publish anything, nor does he grant Fermi to speak at the Physics Congress, in Paris, at the beginning of July 1932 [21]. His colleagues recall that, even before Easter of 1932, he had come to the most important conclusions of his theory: *P*s and *neutral Ps* (as saying *N*s) were bound by *quantum forces* originated simply by their *indistinguishability*, i.e. linked by *exchange forces* of the respective spatial positions (and not also by the spins, as Heisemberg will do [23]), so as to obtain the α particle(and not the deuton:H_1^2) as a saturated system with respect to the *binding energy*. It is interesting to point out that these *exchange forces*, precursors of the Strong Nnuclear Force (SNF), treat equally the *P* and the *N* (or *neutral P*), just as if they were the same particle (SNF behaves in the same way too). Only after Heisemberg publishes his own article on the same subject, Fermi manages to persuade Majorana to go to Heisemberg in Leipzig, who finally manages to convince Majorana to publish (even if so late) his results "[21]: "Uber die Kerntheorie ', work appeared on March 3, 1933 on Zeitschrift fur Physik [24]. Soon after, Majorana publishes another article, entitled "On Theory of Nuclei", in which he writes: "The discovery of the *N*, that is, a heavy elementary particle without electric charge, offered the possibility of building a theory of nuclear structure which, without solving the difficulties associated with the continuous spectrum of *β-rays*, nevertheless makes it possible to widely use the concepts of Quantum Mechanics (QM) in a field that seemed alien to them. According to Heisemberg it is possible for many purposes to consider the nuclei as constituted by *P*s and *N*s, particles provided with the *intrinsic mechanical momentum* ($1/2 \cdot h/2\pi$) which obey the Fermi Statistics and have approximately the same mass. The average velocity of these particles within the nucleus is presumably quite small compared to light's ($v \sim c/10$) and it can therefore be assumed that the ordinary methods of non-relativistic QM can be applied with great approximation. It still remains to establish the law of interaction between the nuclear constituents. Heisemberg, in the absence of other guiding criteria, was led by the analogy that exists between the common neutral hydrogen atom and the *N* if it is constituted, as generally it is supposed, by a *P* and an e^-. Heisemberg therefore assumes that the interaction between *P*s and *N*s is qualitatively similar to that which is actually exercised between *P*s and neutral atoms of hydrogen and depends mainly on a kind of *exchange energy*. Likewise, for each pair of *N*s, attractive forces of the Van der Waals type are introduced "[25].

In this regard, as Recami reports, from a letter dated 1937, signed by Fermi et al., we read: "In modern nuclear theories the contribution made by Ettore Majorana, with the introduction of the forces called '*Majorana Forces'*, is universally recognized among the most fundamental, as the one that allows to understand theoretically the reasons for the stability of the nucleus. Majorana's works today represent the basis for the most important research in this field "[21] [26].

Thus, according to Majorana the 3rd Joliot-Curie Radiation is not at all a form of EMR, but a massive material particle: a *neutral P*, consisting of the *close union* between an e^- with a hydrogen nucleus, i.e. with a *P*. Only in 1934, since he couldn't solve the incompatibilities that emerged between his *neutral P model* with the concepts of the QM, in order not to violate its laws, Majorana accepted the idea of *N* as an elementary particle.

2.2 INCOMPATIBILITY BETWEEN NUCLEAR ELECTRONS AND QM

Even before Majorana's intuition, it had been tried to formulate a congruous explanation to the coexistence of particles with equal electric charges, like the *P*s, in a very narrow space like the nuclear's, without being removed from Coulomb's forces. George Gamov tried to answer this question: "It has often been suggested that non-Coulomb attractive forces play a very important role inside atomic nuclei. We can make many hypothesis concerning the nature of these forces. They can be the attractions between the magnetic moment of the individual constituents of the nucleus or the forces engendered by electric and magnetic polarization. In any case these forces diminish very rapidly with increasing distance from the nucleus and only in the immediate vicinity of the nucleus do they outweigh the Coulomb force"[27]. In this case, however, the picture becomes even more complicated since Rutherford and Harkins' *N model*, as well as the Majorana's *neutral P*, foresee, together with the *P*s, the coexistence of $e^-{}_s$ inside the nucleus itself. In fact "the behavior of the nuclear e^- remained unexplained, which in combination with half of the *nuclear P*s, allowed to consider both the isotopic mass and the atomic number"[11]. The question was: how is it possible the simultaneous presence of positive and negative charges within the atomic nucleus? Again Gamov, among others, tried to give an answer: ""It seems to show that the nuclear $e^-{}_s$ do not count in the statistics of the system; either, for some reasons as yet unknown, the nuclear $e^-{}_s$ must be described by symmetrical wave-function, or we must give up the idea of assigning space coordinates to the $e^-{}_s$ inside the nucleus. At present nitrogen is the only element for which this difficulty has arisen, but it seems probable that it is true in general that the statistics of the nucleus depend only on the total number of *P*s in it. It seems that nuclei with an even number of *P*s always have an even spin, while those with an odd number of *P*s have an odd spin. That indicates that the nuclear $e^-{}_s$ do not make any contribution to the total angular momentum of nucleus"[28].

As we can see, Gamow highlights some problems arising from the Rutherford-Harkins *N model*, with particular reference to a peculiar concept of the QM: the *nuclear Spin Statistics*. In Gamow's later articles these difficulties appear in the discussion of angular momenta of radioactive elements [29][30].

In such circumstances, in fact, it is more than understandable that the *nuclear exchange forces*, operating on the nucleons (i.e. hadrons), can be insensitive to the e^-, although present within the atomic nucleus. In other words: these forces do not detect the presence of these lepton particles, so it is as if they ignored them. However, what remains unexplained is why the $e^-{}_s$, which are fermions, that is provided with a ½ angular momentum, do not give any contribution to the total spin of the nucleus? In this regard we read: "It seems as if the e^- in the nucleus lost not only the spin but the right to participate in nuclear statistics too" [31]. It is as saying that the *nuclear* $e^-{}_s$ behave as if they were not at all in the nucleus!

On the other hand, analyzing some of the measures taken by Ornstein and van Wijk [32], which were further investigated and confirmed by Kronig [33], it appeared that the spin of the nucleus of nitrogen corresponded to an even number. Whereas, according to Rutherford's *N model*, still concerning the nucleus of nitrogen (N_7^{14}), in the nucleus beside the 7 basic *P*s, we have 7 more *P*s closely related to 7 e^-. Thus, within the nucleus appear 21 ½ spin particles. Summing up we have that the nucleus of the nitrogen should have a *half-integer* spin. But this is in open contrast with the experimental data, which show the nitrogen nucleus consisting of 14 nucleons, as its atomic mass (A), so that its spin must express an integer [3]. Shortly thereafter, in U.S. Rasetti carried out a study of the Raman spectra of the nitrogen molecule, pointing out that N_7^{14} nuclei obeyed the Bose-Einstein Statistics, as they showed integer spin [34]. Thus, both Kronig experimental data, and Rasetti's, were in open conflict with the *N model* prospected by Rutherford.

Against this model goes the so-called *Klein paradox* too. Klein was about to study electron scattering trying to cross a potential barrier. Klein's experiment clearly showed that if the value of the potential barrier is of the order of the e^- mass, this barrier is nearly transparent[35]. That is, the Klein experiment presented a quantum mechanical objection to the Rutherford *N model*, that an e^- couldn't be confined within a nucleus by any potential wall.

There is still another concept of the QM that is in antithesis with the hypothesis of the presence of $e^-{}_s$ within the atomic nucleus. As it is well known, for many years it was considered that the e^- emitted with the *N decay* came from the nucleus itself. Even Pauli, for the first years, was convinced that both the e^-, and the 3rd particle emitted with the *N decay*, or the neutrino (ν), he himself had proposed [36], were in the initial nucleus. However, as Maiani reminds us [3], if we bring into play the Heisemberg Uncertainty Principle (HUP) [37] [38] an e^-, located within the radius (R) of the atomic nucleus, would have an energy ($\Delta_{\boldsymbol{p}}$) more than 100 times greater than that of *β-rays* (~1MeV):

$$\Delta_{\boldsymbol{p}} \approx \hbar/R \approx 140 \text{ MeV} \qquad (2)$$

where ħ is Planck's constant, written in the Dirac manner. In fact, according to the QM, simply placing particles in the sphere of radius R implies that these particles have a *momentum* ($\boldsymbol{p}$), as imposed by HUP, of: $\boldsymbol{p} \geqq \hbar/R$ [39].

Therefore, many physicists started to think that, probably, the $e^-{}_s$ wasn't really inside the nucleus and that, therefore, the proposed *N model* was wrong. Fermi goes along with this theory, he writes: "In attempting to construct a theory of nuclear $e^-{}_s$ and of the *β rays* emission, two well known difficulties are encountered. The first is that the primary *β rays* are emitted by the nuclei with a continuous velocity distribution. If the energy conservation principle is not abandoned, we must therefore admit that a fraction of the energy made available in the *β* decay escapes our present observation possibilities. A second difficulty for the nuclear $e^-{}_s$ theory arises because the current relativistic theories of light particles ($e^-{}_s$ or ν_s) do not satisfactorily deal with the possibility that such particles could be bound into orbits of nuclear size. As a consequence it seems more appropriate to admit with Heisenberg that all nuclei only consist of heavy particles, *P*s and *N*s"[40]. In short, as the QM develops, the Rutherford-Harkins *N model* begins to falter. In the end, even Majorana starts to raise some perplexities, abandoning his *neutral P model.* So much so that he writes: "If *N* is really made of a *P* and an e^-, the way their union is realized is however inaccessible to current theories, which would make give to *N* the Bose-Einstein Statistics and an entire multiple mechanical moment of $h/2\pi$, contrary to the fundamental hypotheses. On the other hand, these are directly based on the empirical properties of the nuclei and it is not possible to renounce to them" [25]. And finally, the discoverer of *N*, Chadwick (until then convinced of his master's model, Rutherford) writes: "It is, of course, possible to suppose that the *N* may be an elementary particle. This view has little to recommend at present" [20].

2.3 NEUTRON SYNTHESIS (BARYOGENESIS)

Weinberg writes [41] that the *threshold temperature* necessary for the *materialization* of a particle, i.e. for the transformation of energy into matter, must unequivocally be ≧ to the value obtained by dividing the *inertial energy*, or *zero point energy* [ZPE] [42] of the considered particle, for the Boltzmann constant (*k*), equal to 0.00008617 eV, for each Kelvin degree (°K). It is thus obtained that while for the e^- (with ZPE = 0.511MeV) the threshold temperature corresponds to 5.93 billion ° K, for the *nucleonic synthesis* (*baryogenesis*) really amazing temperatures are needed, which are obtained under very limited circumstances, sometimes only for short periods of time, equal to fractions of one millionth of a second, as soon after the Big Bang (*BB*). In fact, to obtain the formation of *P* (ZPE = 938.26 MeV) the *threshold temperatu*re corresponds to 10888 billion °K. Similarly, the creation of *N* (ZPE = 939.55 MeV) requires a *threshold temperature* of 10903 billion °K [41]. These are very high temperatures that, we could say, in nature are reached only in those situations of *singularities* [43] [44] [45], such as *BB* or Black Holes [46] [47], or *Neutron Stars*: the latter are direct consequences of the collapse of a Supernova.

2.3.1 Big Bang Nucleonic Synthesis

As Pacini reminds us, relativistic cosmological models do not limit the initial density of the Proto-Universe. However, based on QM considerations, based on the HUP, such density can never have exceeded 10^{92}g /cm^3, and for no longer than 10^{-44} seconds. In the immediately following period the density and temperature (T), which expresses the average energy of the photons and the kinetic energy (E_{Kin}) of the particles, are such that the *cosmic fluid* must consist mainly of hadron particles [48]. Indeed, we are in the Age of Hadrons. In this Era the *cosmic fluid* also swarms with pions, as well as with lepton particles such as $e^-{}_s$, ν_s (in the 3 *families*), with relative antiparticles. Photons are very abundant: they are extremely energetic γ photons. The nucleons, in turn, are distributed in almost equal proportions, both as regards the total number of *P*s and *N*s in circulation, as well as the relationship between particles and relative antiparticles. In such phase, in such conditions, that is until T ≧ 10^{13} °K, *P*s and *N*s are continually created, in equal number, together with the respective antiparticles. In this way the new couples (particle-antiparticle) compensate for the annihilating pairs, thus preserving the equilibrium situation. However, the numerical equilibrium *Ps-Ns* remains such only for an infinitesimal time since, as soon as the T of the Universe descends (it descends in the opposite way to the increase of the dimensions of the universe) [41], this equilibrium ceases together with the baryogenesis itself.

In fact, due to the expansion of the universe, the average energy of the particles decreases, and when the average energy of the photons becomes lower than the GeV (value corresponding to the ZPE of the *P* and *N*) the heaviest hadrons in circulation begin to decay, i.e. the nucleons, which however can no longer be created, since now T <10^{13} °K. In addition, the number of nucleons starts to decrease since they collide with the respective antiparticles [48]. At this point, it is important to clarify that, since the primordial nucleosyntesis has not yet begun, *N*s are free, so they spontaneously meet their decay in *P*s(having the latter a mass just below), so the numerical ratio *P–N* will progressively increase in favor of the *P*s.

Therefore, after just one microsecond from the *BB*, T falls to $<10^{13}$ °K so it is no longer possible for new *N*s to form under natural conditions, except for those very special and rare situations of *singularities* which are believed to have occurred from several hundred million years after the *BB*. What are we talking about? Black Holes (BHs) and *neutronization*. In fact, in addition to the *BB*, as Hawking and Penrose remind us [49] [50], the other singularity is represented by the BHs.

2.3.2 Primordial Nucleosynthesis

As known, with the *primordial nucleosyntesis*, which started only 3 minutes and 46 seconds after the BB [41], the lightest chemical elements were formed, namely only the first 3: hydrogen ($H1^1$), helium (He_2^4) and lithium (Li_3^7), in addition to some isotopes related to these elements, among which deuteron (H_1^2) and helium-3(He_2^3)[51]. This is because, since the "Hadron era" is over, now T is too low (~10^9 °K) for the *N synthesis*, so that those *N*s left free tend to spontaneously decay in *P*s. So the progressive lack of *N*s does not allow us to move forward in the synthesis of heavier elements. In fact, observing the Mendeleev Table it is noted that there are no stable nuclei with *atomic mass* (A) = 8, so the *primordial nucleosyntesis* stops at (~10^9 °K), ending approximately within a couple of minutes.

Since then, we reaffirm, it will have to go through several hundred million years, until the conditions of gravity, pressure, density and T are sufficient to see again a natural *N synthesis,* that is, a new baryogenesis. This occurs in the star *core*.

2.3.3 Stellar Nucleosynthesis.

The fundamental process in the evolution of a star is the gravitational contraction of an abundant quantity of gas and dust. Under the influence of gravitational attraction, the mass of gas contracts progressively. Since the contraction releases gravitational energy, the gas that makes up the star is heating up, even for millions of years, until the central temperature has risen to several million degrees [48]. Therefore, the high values of pressure and T reached at the level of the stellar *core* allow the triggering of thermonuclear reactions, with the ignition of the H:

$$4\,H_1^1 \rightarrow He_2^4 + 2e^+ + 2\nu_e + \gamma \qquad (3),$$

where γ indicates gamma photons, highly energetic. Thus the progressive transformation of light elements nuclei into nuclei of heavier elements has begun: the *stellar nucleosynthesis* has begun. In this process of conversion of H into He, part of the stellar mass disappears, having been transformed into energy. Since the amount of energy released is enormous, the T in the star remains high and the pressure of the internal gases is able to counterbalance the gravitational attraction. This phase of equilibrium can last several billion years in stars like the Sun, or last only a few million years in much more massive stars.

When all H of central regions has converted to He, the pace of nuclear reactions slows down due to lack of fuel. Then the star gases cool off, the pressure decreases and, as a consequence, gravity resumes the upper hand, so the star's core contracts. In this regard "In 1930 Chandrasekhar realized that the Pauli Exclusion Principle (PEP) of $e^-{}_s$ gas could provide enough pressure (even in the absence of sources of radiation and at T = 0) to counteract the gravitational attraction and to support the star.

Why the e^-_s? Both because they are much lighter than the nucleons, and because they have more extensive quantum effects "[52].

As known, the nuclear fusion is hindered by electrostatic repulsion between the nuclei, which grows progressively and rapidly as the atomic number(Z) increases. Then, when the nuclear fuel is over, the outer layer of the star collapses on the central core. Based on Chandrasekhar calculations, if in that phase the collapsed star has a mass ≤1.44 solar masses (☼) (Chandrasekhar *limit mass*), the gravitational collapse is stopped by the counter-pressure exerted by the *degenerate electrons* which make the stellar core, to which a *white dwarf* will remain, over time [53]. The *limit mass of Chandrasekhar* (M_{Ch}) is determined as follows:

$$M_{Ch} \approx 3\sqrt{2\pi}/8\ (\hbar c/G)^{3/2}\ [(Z/A)\cdot 1/_{\mu} m_p]^2 \quad (4),$$

where ħ is Planck's constant, *c* is the speed of light in the vacuum, *G* is the constant of universal gravitation, *Z* is the atomic number, A is the atomic mass, m_p is the inertial mass of the proton, μ indicates the number of nucleons. With Z/A=0.5, we have M_{Ch}=1.44☼ [54].

As Maiani reminds us "The fusion of complex elements, like carbon (C_6^{12}), oxygen (O_8^{16}) or neon (Ne_{10}^{20}), requires higher and higher ignition temperatures, which are only realized in the stars that start with masses much higher than 1 ☼ "[52]. In fact, it is calculated that to get to the synthesis of iron, stars with mass greater than 8 ☼ are needed [55]. In these circumstances there is a further contraction of the central regions, with a consequent increase in the T: this time up to hundreds of millions of °K, and even beyond. Then the conditions were created to trigger a new type of reaction, in which 3 helium nuclei merge into a carbon nucleus: 3 $He_2^4 \rightarrow C_6^{12}$ (3-body reaction). After which since the helium fuel is finished, there is a central contraction, accompanied by a heating. Thus, by successive degrees, increasingly heavier elements will be formed, up to the iron (Fe_{26}^{56}) [48]. For the synthesis of Fe temperatures $>10^9$ °K are necessary [54].

With Fe the standard *stellar nucleosynthesis* stops.

2.3.4 Explosive Nucleosynthesis

It is well known that Fe has a particularly stable nucleus. In fact, when the nucleus of Fe was formed, the maximum nuclear *binding energy* was reached, and therefore there are no more exo-energetic nuclear reactions that can sustain the star [39]. Now the possible fusion reactions no longer produce energy, thus we loose that heat, which irradiated outwards (exothermic reactions), was returned through the processes of nuclear fusion. On the contrary, with Fe such reactions become endothermic, as they absorb energy from the outside. It follows that the thermonuclear reactions within the stellar core stop, whereby the stellar gases begin to cool, and the star to contract. The nucleus of the star, therefore, no longer supported by nuclear reactions, implodes and surrounding matter falls around [39]. At this point, if the mass is > M_{Ch}, but ~ <3☼, the star will continue to contract ever more rapidly, becoming even brighter till it reaches, finally, in hours or minutes, its inexorable collapse, which takes place in ≈1/4 second. That is, when the nucleus of the star has reached nuclear densities, that is the same density of atomic nuclei (equal to 10^{13}g/cm^3), the fall stops and the matter, which was falling, rebounds on the star core and the star explodes: *collapse supernova*. With the collapse of the star an immense amount of energy is reversed on the outer layers of the star. We have that while the internal parts fall on themselves, the external ones are hit by an immense amount of energy and projected outside, in interstellar space [48]: a *Supernova* is born.

As Maiani reports, while "elements up to Fe are synthesized in the life of the stars (*stellar nucleosynthesis*), the heaviest elements are synthesized in the *Ns flow* of the supernovae final phase and therefore dispersed in the explosion of the supernovae themselves" [52]: *explosive nucleosynthesis*. What happens is that, in the stars with mass >M_{Ch}, once the Fe is formed, the *stellar nucleosynthesis* stops, since the Fe is not meltable. Therefore, once there is no more fuel, hence no more thermonuclear reactions, the gravity takes over: the star begins to contract, with a significant and progressive increase of the T, pressure and density, and the photons acquire energies of the MeV order. Thus, roughly all the nuclei of the natural elements, heavier than the Fe, are generated in the central regions of the star during the collapse and the subsequent explosion, as a consequence of the *neutron capture* process. The strong shock wave produced by the rebound on the star cores of *degenerate neutrons* is such as to trigger explosive reactions of nuclear fusion in the gas falling towards the core itself. These fusion reactions produce a large *flow* of *N*s which are absorbed by the nuclei of Fe_{26}^{56}, to form isotopes rich in *N*s and therefore unstable [55]. These subsequently decay by fission forming all the heaviest elements of the Fe (that is, with A>56), as well as other stable nuclei of the Fe, such as: Fe_{26}^{54}, Fe_{26}^{57} and Fe_{26}^{58}.

It is necessary to bear in mind that when the density reaches the value of 10^{12}g/cm^3, e^-_s have also acquired a huge amount of energy, they become *relativistic*, so that the minimum energy configuration of *P*s and *N*s changes, as energetic e^- violently struck against the *P*s of Fe nuclei, they are able to convert them to *N*s through an *electron capture* process (*inverse β process, or β-decay*$^+$):

$$e^- + P \rightarrow N + \nu_e \qquad (5).$$

We have that an e^- so much energetic (*relativistic*) is able to give to the *P*, its own E_{Kin} to gain that energy gap, corresponding to 0.78281 MeV, transported by the *N* [56].

These e^-, moreover, benefit from an environmental context of very high pressure, such as to overcome the *electric or Coulomb repulsion* between e^- and *P*s, so that these particles can more easily be pushed against each other to form *N*s. As known, in normal matter it is just this Coulomb *repulsion* to prevent the compression of matter, but if the electric repulsion is missing, or is overwhelmed, the matter can be compressed up to 10^{14} g/cm^3, or more. In short, with the increasing contraction of the star the conditions of a complete *degeneration of the electrons* have been created, thus (as the PEP imposes) there have not been any *free states* a possible emitted e^- could occupy, which categorically prevents each *N*, as the one created in Eq.(5), to return to being a *P* [54]. It is like saying that e^-_s and *Ps neutronize*, creating a *protostar of N*s.

Initially, the ν_e emitted in Eq.(5), succeed in escaping from the star with quite easily, but subsequently the density in the stellar core increases rapidly to become opaque to these same ν_s. Moreover, at high temperatures of the stellar core (T≈10^6 °K), the e^- e^+ pairs go to thermal equilibrium with ν_s and $\bar{\upsilon}_s$ of all *flavors*. Finally, the external parts of the stellar *core* in collapse *rebound* on the central *core* (incompressible) of *degenerate neutrons*, which form the *neutron star*. With the rebound a shockwave is created that propagates outwards and sweeps away the outer layers of the star, thus triggering the *supernova explosion* [55].

This wave is pushed by the *thermal* ν_s, which carry a considerable fraction of the gravitational energy released [53]. Only 1% of the released energy is observable (represented by the E_{Kin} of the shock wave and by the radiation), while the remaining 99% is taken away by the ν_s, just formed by the *neutronization* process. Therefore, a shock wave has been created, which sweeps away the outer atmosphere of the star, up to the outside of the star itself. Thus, an intense ν_s radiation is emitted, announcing the *Supernova*: the light will arrive a few hours later [52].

2.3.5 Neutronization and Neutron Stars

As we have seen, Eq. (5) shows a typical example of *neutronization*, represented by the creation of a *N*, induced by the coupling of a *P* with an e^-, which, provided with a formidable E_{Kin}, succeeds in overwhelming the electric repulsion which, in general, keeps these two particles apart. Then, with the *neutronization* the $e^-{}_s$, compressed on the *P*s, join them forming *N*s (and emitting ν_s) [57]. This is a very peculiar phenomenon, which occurs in very few circumstances such as, for example, in the core of massive shrinking stars, when particular conditions of very high gravity, pressure, T and density are created.

Just when the density reaches a value of 10^7g/cm^3 the process of *neutronization* of matter starts, triggered by the remarkable E_{Kin} acquired by a free *degenerate electron*. Its energy is so high as to compensate and balance the mass gap between *P* and *N*, allowing the reaction illustrated in Eq. (5), and inhibiting the opposite one, which currently occurs under normal conditions, i.e. 'low density', known as *N disintegration* or β-decay$^-$ (βd^-) [57]:

$$N \rightarrow P + e^- + \bar{\upsilon}_e \qquad (6).$$

With the progressive increase of density, in the contracting star the *neutronization* increases dramatically, while the number of *P*s and $e^-{}_s$ decrease. At a density of the order of 10^{14}g/cm^3, i.e. one order of magnitude greater than the density of nuclear matter, 80% of the *Ns*, no longer bound within the nuclei, form a *degenerate gas*, so defined for its peculiar behavior [57]. In fact, taking advantage of the insights developed by both Fermi and Dirac, it is inferred that, in an ordinary gas, the pressure decreases parallel to the decrease of T, since the degree of thermal agitation of the atoms decreases. On the contrary, in the case of *degenerate matter*, this does not occur, because of the very high density. In fact, when the particles are extremely close to each other, there are effects of QM that induce a kind of repulsion between the particles. In other words, a form of *counter-pressure* opposes to the gravity, like an anti-gravitational pressure, which in turn is related to two basic principles of QM: the HUP and the PEP. According to the QM, the simple fact of confining particles in a sphere of radius (*r*) implies that these particles are provided with a *momentum* (***p***):

$$\boldsymbol{p} \geqq \hbar/r \qquad (7).$$

At this *momentum* corresponds a *pressure* [39].

In turn, the PEP establishes that 2 identical fermions will never have the same quantum numbers and occupy the same *phase space* cell. Therefore, if each the two fermions with lower energy have a *momentum* (***p***), as described by Eq. (7), the next pair will have: $\boldsymbol{p} \geqq 2\,\hbar/r$, and so on. Thus, the average

momenta, brought by the particles, are greater than if they were all in the *fundamental state*. This gives rise to a pressure that increases more than linearly with respect to the number of particles [39]. It happens, that is, that even with T=0 there is a pressure, the so-called *Fermi pressure*, whose counter-pressure action is able to support the weight of masses less than about 3 ☼, until the gravitational contraction ceases [48]. In the end, therefore, what remains of the old stellar *core* of the exploded Supernova, is a tiny celestial body, with a diameter of 10-20 Km, on average, of which only one cm^3 weighs about 200 million tons: a *Neutron Star* was born.
Whereas, if the mass exceeds the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff *limit* [58] [59], equal to ~ 2.5-3 ☼, the gravity of the *neutron star* can no longer be balanced by the *Ns degeneration pressure* (or *Fermi pressure*) . The Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff *limit* has a certain approximation, especially regarding the lower limit. The uncertainty in the value reflects the fact that the equations of state for the *extremely condensed matter* are not known, that is to say, the equation of state of the *degenerate neutrons* is not yet well defined. Thus, the gravitational contraction proceeds even more quickly and violently, since the greater gravitational mass creates even more marked pressure and density conditions than in the *neutron stars*.
Therefore, it also goes towards the inexorable collapse, with subsequent explosion. Both during the final phase of the contraction and in the explosive phase, the conditions for the nucleosynthesis of all the heaviest elements of the Fe are created, up to uranium: *explosive nucleosynthesis*. The exploded Supernova, however, this time creates a different astral body: a BH.
Summing up, we have highlighted that *N synthesis* is only performed in particular conditions of gravity, pressure, T and density, as occurs with the *BB*, or during the *primordial nucleosynthesis*, or in the *stellar* and *explosive nucleosynthesis*, as in the processes of *neutronization* and *electron capture*.

2.4 NEUTRON DECAY

When Marie Curie observed for the first time the *N decay*, or *negative β-decay* (βd^-), she only associated it to the emission of an e^-:

$$N \rightarrow P + e^- \quad (8).$$

In Eq.(8) appears that the sum of the masses of the *P* and e^- (and thus the sum of the corresponding energy values) is less than the mass of the *N*. In the βd^- many Conservation Laws were not respected, among which immediately stood out the violation of the Law of Conservation of Mass and Energy. For some years it was not possible to find a solution. Even Bohr thought that it was necessary to accept this deficiency: it seemed to him it was inevitable to resign to the violation of those conservation laws.
Pauli instead did not give up, until he proposed ('a desperate remedy') the assumption that the emission of a 3rd particle without electric charge could compensate for this gap[36]. In fact, after much hesitation, on 04/12/1930 Pauli sent that famous letter to the participants of the Congress of Physics in Tubingen. Pauli wrote:

“Dear Radioactive Ladies and Gentlemen, as the bearer of these lines, to whom I graciously ask you to listen, I will explain to you in more detail, because of the "wrong" statistics of the N- and Li-6 nuclei and the continuous β spectrum, I have hit upon a desperate remedy to save the ‘exchange theorem’ of statistics and the law of conservation of energy. Namely, the possibility that in the nuclei there could exist electrically neutral particles, which I will call neutrons, that have spin 1/2 and obey to the exclusion principle and that further differ from light quanta in that they do not travel with the velocity of light. The mass of the neutrons should be of the same order of magnitude as the electron mass and in any event not larger than 0.01 proton mass. The continuous β spectrum would then make sense with the assumption that in β decay, in addition to the electron, a neutron is emitted thus the sum of the energies of neutron and electron is constant. But so far I do not dare to publish anything about this idea, and trustfully turn first to you, dear radioactive people, with the question of how likely it is to find experimental evidence for such a neutron if it would have the same or perhaps a 10 times larger ability to get through [material] than a gamma-ray. I admit that my remedy may seem almost improbable because one probably would have seen those neutrons, if they exist, for a long time. But nothing ventured, nothing gained. Thus, dear radioactive people, scrutinize and judge. Your humble servant W. Pauli"[36]. Therefore, Pauli called this new particle neutron. The neutron (*N*) as such was discovered by Chadwick only two years later[19][20], thus Pauli’s neutron was called *neutrino* (ν) as suggested by Amaldi to Fermi[40]. Klein adds: “In order to save the Law of Conservation of Energy, Pauli makes a hypothesis very bold: contrary to appearances, the core does not disintegrate into two bodies (another nucleus that is a *P* and an e^-), but in three. At the same time a 3rd particle is issued carrying with it the missing energy"[60].

2.4.1 Negative β-Decay (*βd*⁻)

In that regard Fermi elaborated one of his masterpieces, the Theory of *N* Disintegration, or β-Decay. Fermi writes: "We still have the problem of knowing the laws of forces acting between the particles making up the nucleus. It has indeed, we admit – together with Pauli - the existence of the so-called neutrino, in the continuous spectrum of β rays, some clues that, according to Bohr, this would suggest that perhaps in these new unknown laws even the Principle of Conservation of Energy is not valid any more; unless electrically neutral particle having a mass of the order of magnitude of the electron mass. This, for its enormous penetrating power, escapes any current detection method, and its E_{Kin} helps to restore the energy balance in the β disintegrations"[61]. Whenever in a radioactive nucleus there is the spontaneous disintegration of a *N*, it follows the emission of a *P*, a β ray and a 3rd particle, the *neutrino*(ν), which with its mass, together with its high E_{Kin}, compensates for the amount of energy and mass that cannot be entirely taken by the *β ray* [40][61].

The Fermi’s β-decay formula is described by the Eq.(6), where Fermi introduces the emission of the 3rd particle (electrically neutral) suggested by Pauli. What does Fermi tell us with its *formula*? Namely: 1) *P* and *N* are two different states of the same fundamental object or Nucleon. 2) The e^- ejected, or *β ray*, does not exist within the nucleus, but it is created, together with this 3rd particle during the process of the *N* transformation into *P* (in what Fermi deviates from Pauli, still convinced of the intranuclear presence of e^-, despite the inconsistencies highlighted by the QM). 3) The process

of radioactive decay of the nucleon is governed by a new Fundamental Force introduced by Fermi: the Weak Nuclear Interaction (WI or Fermi's Interaction).
In fact, the explanation of the *N β-decay*(βd^-) Fermi gave in 1933 [40] was the prototype of the WI. He, taking as a model the description of the *e^-–P diffusion*, provided by Quantum-Electro- Dynamics (QED), proposes also for the βd^- a type of interaction based on the field theory. Fermi uses the mathematical formalism of the operators of creation and destruction of particles introduced to the QED by Dirac, Jordan and Klein, called "second quantization"[62][63][64].
In this case, however, the interaction is punctiform and called '4 fermions interaction'. It constitutes a *contact interaction* between the 4 particles involved: the *N* (which constitutes the initial state) plus the *P*, the e^- and this 3rd particle, or ν[65].

2.4.2 *βd⁻ Mass gap problem*

As already highlighted by Madame Curie, in the *N* decay emerges a conspicuous *mass-energy gap problem*, clearly redeemable by Eq. (8). With a *brilliant stroke* Pauli proposes the solution: with the βd^- a 3rd particle, with a neutral charge, is emitted, and with the same mass and spin of e^- [36]. Fermi fully embraces the proposal of Pauli, and inserts it in his equation of the *N* decay - see Eq. (6) - through the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$, considering the neutrinos (ν_s) elementary particles, with neutral electric charge, and having the same mass of e^- [61].
In short, in order to solve the *N* decay evident *mass gap problem*, Pauli [36] proposes a precise, determined and imperative solution, fully shared by Fermi [61]: the 3rd particle emitted must have the same mass of the e^- and be sufficiently accelerated, since it must carry a mass of ~ 50% more than the *inertial mass* (0.511MeV) of the e^-.
In fact, let's try to analyze the mass-energy gap emerging from the βd^-. Let's evaluate the masses of the particles represented in Eq.(8), that is without the $\bar{\upsilon}$. The *N* weighs $1.67492728\cdot10^{-24}$[g], while the *P* weighs $1.67262171\cdot10^{-24}$[g]; on its turn the e^- weighs $9.1093826\cdot10^{-28}$[g]. The mass difference between *N* and *P* corresponds to Δ_M ($0.00230557\cdot10^{-24}$[g]), that is $\Delta_M = 2.30557\cdot10^{-27}$ [g]. According to the mass-energy conversion factors, if we consider that "1 MeV is about $1.782\cdot10^{-27}$[g]" [66], and follow the *cgs* metric system, we have:

$$(2.30557/1.782)\cdot10^{-27}[\text{g}] = 1.29381\ \text{MeV/c}^2 \qquad (9).$$

This is the energy value that in the βd must be carried away by the e^- and a 3rd particle, in order to safeguard the energy-mass balance in this process. The energy value expressed in Eq.(9) represents the maximum value of the energy spectrum ($\eta=E_{Max}$) of the β radiation emitted with βd.
The minimum energy carried away by an e^- corresponds to 0.511MeV, thus the value of Eq.(9) is more than double than the energy of an e^- not particularly accelerated. With the decay of the *N*, instead, the *β ray* is accelerated to a very high speed, showing a marked E_{Kin}. Nevertheless, only in very limited circumstances, and *randomly*, the total energy carried away by the β radiation is able to compensate for the difference in mass-energy between *N* and *P*[56]. If we substract the *minimum energy* of an e^- from the energy value expressed by Eq.(9), we obtain the maximum value of the energy(Δ_E) that could be covered by the 3rd particle of the βd **:**

$$\Delta_E = 0.78281\text{MeV} \qquad (10).$$

This value exceeds the 53.14% the energy of an e^- *at rest*. But it is worth pointing out that this is the maximum value the 3rd particle can reach (considering that at the same time the e^- is emitted too).

This does not mean that it always has so much energy, rather the contrary. In fact in the value expressed by Eq.(9) we must also consider the E_{Kin} of the β-ray, whose energy spectrum, as Fermi had reported [40][65], may also coincide with the entire energy value described by Eq.(9).

2.4.3 On the Identity of the *βd⁻* 3rd Particle

From the analysis of the *βd*, we seem to catch two important results: 1) the total energy of the emitted charged electron(e^-) can fluctuate randomly (depending on the intensity of acceleration) in a precise range between 1.29381MeV and 0.511MeV. 2) The energy the 3rd particle can acquire, should fluctuate, still randomly distributed between 0.78281MeV and 0.511MeV.

Well, it is of fundamental importance to stress that these mass values correspond to those of a more or less accelerated e^-, but not those of a ν_e, which mass is considered to be ≤ 0.00001 electron masses! It therefore follows that, in order to leave the equation, valid, i.e. mathematically congruous, the corresponding value of $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ must be between 0.511 and 0.78281 MeV.

It should also be noted that the 3rd particle inserted by Pauli and Fermi in the *N-decay formula* (Eq.6), both it is a ν or another particle not yet identified, can show an energy value not fixed, stable, but randomly variable, oscillating in a range between 0.511MeV and 0.78281MeV (since, like the e^- emitted, the energy that the 3rd particle will acquire depends on the acceleration at the time of emission).

The figures don't add up. There are two things: either ν_e carries a mass-energy oscillating in the described range (that is at least 5 orders of magnitude greater than the mass attributed to ν), or the 3rd particle emitted with *βd* is another particle, most likely still unknown.

2.4.4 The Mass breaks the Symmetry; *Gauge Theories*

The *Standard Model* (SM) has considered the mass of ν = 0 since, according to the SM, the *mass* of a particle breaks the *symmetry*. In fact the technical basis of the SM of elementary particles is made up of a basic principle, known as local *Gauge Invariance* or local G*auge Symmetry*. That is, as Madame Noether [67] and Weyl[68] had already realized the behavior of Nature is invariant under certain transformations on its fundamental constituents, such as the fields of fundamental particles.

"According to Weyl's theory, the way a clock measures time does not depend solely on its current position, but also on the previously positions. Likewise, the emission frequencies of a hydrogen atom will depend both on its current and past positions. It is like saying: the behavior of the atom will depend on its history, despite contradicting experimental evidence. However, Weyl's idea contained a fatal mistake, which Einstein clearly saw from the beginning"[69].

In fact, Einstein pointed out that the laws of physics are not invariant under *gauge transformations* and the elegant electromagnetic field theory had to be abandoned. Indeed, "the observation that the laws of physics are not invariant for *gauge transformations* dates back to Galileo Galilei "[70].

Einstein had shown that the mathematical formalism introduced by Weyl was excessively *incoherent* and incongruous, as well as blatantly clashing with the experimental evidence. In short, the Mathematics supported by Weyl belied and contradicted the basic principles of the Theory of Relativity! It was really unacceptable.

Pauli also was in full disagreement with the Weyl's *gauge theory*. In this regard, he immediately published two articles. In the first [71], as Sparzani tells us, Pauli pointed out a sign error ("a little oversight" [71]) in one of Weyl's formulas. In the 2nd article, however, there is a pitiless and dry criticism [72]: "In Weyl's theory we continuously work with the intensity of the field within the e^-. However, for a physicist, the latter is defined as a force acting on a test field, and since there are no test bodies smaller than an e^-, the notion of an electric field internality in a mathematical point appears to be an empty function, with no content. It would be preferable to reaffirm that in physics we must introduce only quantities that are observable in principle. Thus: would we not be completely off track if we pursued a theory of continuum within the e?"[73].
Nevertheless, taking inspiration from Fock's works (1926) on the *electron's wave function equation* (Schrodinger), or the London's works (1927) on *superconductivity*, in 1929 Weyl published another work in which he attributed great importance to the *Gauge Theories* [74]. This article also fully preserves the same parameters and mathematical procedures previously contested by Einstein and Pauli, as the assumption that "in an invariant *gauge* theory, all the particles should have zero mass like the photon" [70].
The downside of the *Gauge Symmetry Theories* lies in the fact, really paradoxical from a *logical* point of view, that the introduction of a simple mass parameter, necessary to describe the mass of a particle, is in contradiction with the existence of this symmetry: it is said, that is, that *the mass breaks the gauge symmetry*. According to SM the problem can be solved by assuming that all particles have a null intrinsic mass and postulating the existence of a *complex scalar field* permeating the space. The re-introduction of the mass parameter causes the gauge symmetry to be no more explicit, but that is spontaneously broken: *Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking*(*SSB*) [75],[76],[77][78]. It is in this case a *symmetry hidden from the mass.*
Furthermore, it seems interesting to quote Maiani: "The conservation of the Electric Charge finds its theoretical basis in the *gauge invariance* of Maxwell equations" [79], while "the conservation of the Baryonic Number is not associated with any *gauge invariance* and has always appeared as an artificial rule, however it applies with great precision"[79].
Actually, this leaves us perplexed because the *gauge invariance* does not coincide with one of the fundamental laws of Physics: the Law of Conservation of the Baryon Number. Yet this law is always preserved: "it applies with great precision" [79]. It is even possible to consider that maybe something "artificial" lies in the "rules", or *dogmas*, which are the basis of *gauge theories*, after all, according to Einstein and Pauli, that Mathematics is not up to standards.
In fact, with regard to SM, Maiani underlines: "Unfortunately, the approximate calculation methods available (the Perturbation Theory) are not completely reliable" [80].

2.4.5 ν has an extremely small mass

After the evidence for oscillation of atmospheric $\nu_{s,}$ carried out at the Super-Kamiokande [81], also the SM, reluctantly, had to recognize a mass at ν, though infinitesimal, and of 5 orders of magnitude less than electron masses. On the other hand the disintegration of the *N*, or negative β-decay (βd^-), shows that the energy value attributable to ν corresponds to <5.8 eV (many A.A. attribute to *ν* an infinitely smaller mass). Why this limit? This limitation was inferred from the observations of Supernova 1987A, for which it had been assumed that the mass of the electronic ν (ν_e) was <5.8 eV[82]. Why? Because the ν_s of this supernova arrived on Earth a few hours before the visible light; so they "must have traveled at a speed very close to that of light. Since lighter particles travel faster than heavier ones, scientists have concluded that the mass of ν is very small"[83]. Maiani states: "The current upper limits of the mass of the ν_s emitted with the *β-decay* are m_ν <2eV"[84], a value corresponding to <1/250000 of the electron mass!

2.4.6 Pauli-Fermi's Requests on the 3rd particle of the *βd⁻*

At this point it can be useful to analyze the basic requirements originally requested by Pauli and Fermi for the ν, i.e. for the 3rd particle or missing particle in the *βd*, defined by several authors as a *ghost particle*. These requests are essentially three: 1) it is electrically neutral; 2) it has the mass of an e^-; 3) it has the same spin of the e^- [36][40][61].

Well, why not to think immediately to the possible existence of a neutral electron (e°)?

All requests would be satisfied. It seems the most *logical* answer, and physically more than adequate to meet the demands of Pauli and Fermi. Even in this way the energy balance in the *N* disintegration is restored, thus safeguarding the Laws of Conservation of Mass and Energy and at the same time safeguarding the Law of Conservation of Electric Charge, Angular Momentum and Lepton Number[85]. Moreover, we want to emphasize that referring to this 3rd neutral particle emitted with the *βd*, Pauli wrote: "it has ½ spin and its mass should be of the same order of magnitude of the $e^-{}_s$" [36]. That is, according to Pauli, this 3rd particle should be a fermion, with the mass of the e^-, but without carrying electric charge: it could really possible to think of an e^- without electric charge, a *neutral electron* (e°).

However, it could be said that the same results reached by an e° are obtained similarly even with a ν. And then: e° does not exist, this is an invention! The only known $e^-{}_s$ are those carrying an electric charge: e^- and e^+. Yet even the ν, when suggested by Pauli, was an invention. Moreover the ν was a particle totally unknown, invented from scratch. Indeed, it was introduced in Physics, *compulsorily*, a new family of particles, with their own characteristics, and with presumed properties quite different from the other elementary particles known at the time.

The e°, instead, refers to one of the fundamental particles more widespread in nature, even if only those electrically charged are known. In addition, a not negligible result, with the e° it is not necessary to invent a new category of particles to be added to the SM, maintaining the symmetry of the SM and further simplifying it (according to the *reductionist* approach preferably adopted in Physics)[86].

Yet, one might object: why the e° has never been detected, even accidentally? Electron decay products emerge continuously in the *colliders*!

But it is clear: the crucial difference lies in the fact that we are talking about electrons without electricity charge, they do not interact with matter for all the same reasons ν_s do not interfere.

2.4.7 Very little interactivity of the 3rd particle of the *βd⁻*

In short, let's try to understand why the third particle emitted by the *βd* does not interact at all with the matter, so it has never been seen directly: 1) Being a lepton particle, whether it matches the ν, or it is represented by an e°, it follows that it is insensitive to the Strong Nuclear Force(SNF). 2) Being neutral particles (one of the primary requirements dictated by Pauli and Fermi), they are insenitive to Electro-Magnetic Interaction too. 3) Its very small mass makes it very weakly subject to Gravity Interaction (GI), although it is sensitive to such interaction.

In this regard Feynman reminds us: “The gravitational activation between two objects is extremely weak: the GI between two electrons is less than the electrical strength of a 10^{-40} factor (or maybe 10^{-41})"[66]. Furthermore, considering that the GI action in itself is extremely weak, and considering that the particle in question travels at very high speed, hence it proves insensitive to the GI. 4) In addition, the 3rd particle emitted with βd^- is right-handed, just as the hypothetical ῡ (or the possible ē°), so it is even more elusive, since it is also insensitive to Weak Interaction(WI).

But even considering the respective particles, which are left-handed, and therefore potentially sensitive to WI, they are essentially unaffected. First of all because the very high acceleration with which the 3rd particle (both in βd_s and in the process of nuclear fusion) makes this particle travel undoubtedly with relativistic speed, reducing in this way the time the WI - and the GI - can exercise their action[56]. Moreover the WI action is notoriously weak, and quite *slow* ($\sim 10^{-8} - 10^{-16}$ seconds) compared to the GI and SNF, thus it is even more difficult that it may prevail on the E_{Kin} the 3rd particle travels. The WI acts only on a short distance, which restricts even more the possibilities of such a particle to interact since, as it can be seen from our calculations, the maximum distance WI bosons can travel corresponds to $1.543 \cdot 10^{-15}$ [cm] for W^+ and W^- particles, and $1.36 \cdot 10^{-15}$[cm] for Z° particles[87]. So, even e°, despite being sensitive to the WI (since it is left-handed), should be able to cross every *weak field* undisturbed.

It is important to add, finally, that probably the most significant reason for the scarce interactivity of ν with the matter is provided by Maiani, he reminds us that: "The ν_s produced in the Big Bang (*BB*) do not interact with matter when the T of the Universe falls below 1MeV "[88]. Yet it is a very high T, just below $3 \cdot 10^9$ °K [41]. This limit of T is far above most of the common physical reactions. If we then consider that the T that permeates the entire Universe is <3°K, close to absolute 0, it is better understood ν_s why the never interact, or almost never, neither with matter, nor with other ν_s [89].

2.4.8 *Pseudo-Detection* of ν or of the 3rd particle: Never *Directly* Identified

One could say: while the e° has never been seen, the ν is continuously produced in nuclear reactors and detected with particular equipment.

In this regard, however, a fundamental clarification must be made: every time it was considered that the ν_s had been detected, they were always *indirect detections* thanks to traces left by a *ghost particle* never detected *de visu*, never directly identified. At this regard, the apparatus designed by Reines and Cowan [90] for the ν detection was made of a target of about 1000 liters of aqueous solution of cadmium chloride contained in two containers alternating with three other containers filled with a liquid scintillator acting as a detector. Thus, installing this system near nuclear reactors, in which constantly occur countless βd^-, it could happen that the alleged ῡ issued, bombing water *P*s, created a reverse process, i.e. a βd^+, transforming the *P* in *N*, moreover the emission of an e^+ and a ν. Since it was known that the 3rd particle emitted in this process could never be detected, identified directly, Reines and Cowan pointed the research on two the other particles: *N* and e^+. The race of the *N* emitted is slowed, "moderated", by the collisions with water thus, in about 10^{-5} seconds, the *N* is captured by cadmium, with immediate emission of γ rays of a particular frequency and energy (~6MeV). The e^+, in its turn, annihilating with an e^- of the water, generates a pair of γ photons of a defined frequency, able to produce light in the scintillators placed along the walls surrounding water. Such light is detected by photomultipliers. The characteristic time is ~10^{-9} seconds, and the coincidence between two scintillators represents the time (t_o) of the measure. Therefore, in the same pair of scintillators it occurs a delayed coincidence, compared to t_o [90]. In short, we can divide this experiment into two phases:

1) The 1st stage takes into account any βd^- which occurred in the nuclear reactor, resulting in the emission of a 3rd particle, believed to be a ῡ.

2) The 2nd stage considers the effects produced by the clash between the 3rd particle (or this ῡ) with a *P* of the water contained in the tanks: what occurs is a βd^+ with emission of a ν (which, just as the ῡ will never be disclosed) and with the emission of an e^+ which, annihilating with an e^- of that same water, produces the pair of γ photons detected by the photomultiplier.

That's all. That is, the strategy of *data taking* by the experimenters essentially consists in recording time, which separate the events sought, and the energy value registered by the photomultipliers.

It is the detection of the impact's effects, such as the Cherenkov Effect (*CE*) [91][92], to prove the existence of ν, although it might be another particle to induce the *CE*.

It does not seem to be a chance that in Nature the *CE* is only elicited by e^-_s. That is the mark that distinguishes events sought is therefore a double coincidence in a pair of scintillators, separated by a time of a few microseconds. If instruments had revealed γ rays exactly of two energies provided, separated by suitable intervals, the investigators would have caught the ῡ. Thus, this was enough to believe to have found, specifically and unequivocally the effects of the elusive ῡ.

With good conscience, this statement seems to us a *stretch* in the interpretation of the findings. That statement, in our view, requires a preconceived, a *dogma*: that the 3rd particle emitted with βd^- must be only and unquestionably a ῡ, no other type of particle.

To this purpose, among the several techniques to detect the ν we can mention two ν detectors: the Subdury Neutrino Observatory (SNO) and the Super-Kamiokande. They are both made of huge pools of water, whose walls are covered with an infinity of 'light detectors', or photomultipliers. Both experiments use the procedure characterizing the 2nd phase of the detection of Reines and Cowan, for which the alleged ῡ (or 3rd particle of βd^-) strikes a *P* of a water molecule, triggering a βd^+: the e^- freed at relativistic speeds, traveling faster than light (in the same medium), emit the typical *Cherenkov light* (*CL*) which is captured by photomultipliers (*CE*) [91][93].

It is believed that it is the ν to trigger the series of reactions leading to the production of the *CL*: event for us perfectly reasonable even more if it were an e°, since it is just e^-_s to emit the *CL* in our atmosphere. In fact, the e^-_s of the atmospheric molecules, hit by cosmic rays at high altitude, are accelerated at very high speed so emitting the *CL*. There is no other particle in nature, apart from e^-_s and the alleged ν, to be able to produce the *CL*. Yet, even in these experiments (SNO and

Superkamiokande) the ν remains elusive: it is only possible to detect the effects of the invisible particle, the *ghost particle* issued in *βd* [56]. Nevertheless, in such surveys the production of *CL* and *CE*s are considered as the evidence of the existence of ν and ῡ.
This interpretation of the experimental data seems to us *forcing* for three reasons: 1) since the precise identikit of the 3rd particle emitted with *βd* is not known, we cannot say with scientific certainty that the effects it produces are attributable specifically and exclusively to a ν ; 2) we know, with certainty, that the *CL* is a typical natural phenomenon generated by e^-s highly accelerated (which, as we know, are released also in *βd*s); 3) the fact that it is known and proven that the *CL* is produced specifically by extremely accelerated e^-s, makes clear, fair, compatible, and even more likely the hypothesis that in *βd*s are emitted e° too (or its antiparticle) instead of ν. No wonder it is still an e^-, now without electric charge, to induce the various *CE*s highlighted during all the surveys carried out.
Yet we are talking about the ν, a particle with a precise and determined characteristic: its mass must be equal to the mass of the e^-! This is really the minimum value that can be attributed to the 3rd particle, to balance numbers into the *N* disintegration, or βd^-.

2.4.9 A New *βd* Model: ē° instead of $\bar{\upsilon}_e$

A clear incongruity comes out: the mass attributed to the ν will never be able to compensate the mass gap problem of the *N* decay. Never ever: it takes from 100,000 to 250,000 to balance the Eq. (6)! Unless we take into consideration, instead of ν, another particle, probably still unknown, as the 3rd particle of βd^-.
This is certainly a very elusive particle, never directly identified, *de visu*, but always and only for *indirect detection* (through the verification of the *CE*), which is also referred to as *the ghost particle*. It cannot be any particle, but it must satisfy certain requests: 1) In order to preserve the Law of Electric Charge, within the Eq. (6), it must be neutral. 2) In order to comply with the Law of Conservation of the Lepton Number, it must certainly be an anti-lepton. 3) In order to safeguard the Laws of Mass and Energy Conservation, its values must absolutely be between 0.78281MeV and 0.511MeV. Thus, this 3rd particle will first have to correspond to a neutral anti-lepton. At this point, the circle has really tightened: the only known anti-leptons are $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ and e^+. But since it must be a neutral anti-lepton, we must also renounce the e^+. And what's left? Only the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$. But we exclude it, because of its very limited mass. There would be a ῡ more massive than a $\bar{\upsilon}_e$: the *muonic* ῡ ($\bar{\upsilon}_\mu$), however the maximum mass attributed to ν_μ is 170 KeV, so it would necessary at least 3 $\bar{\upsilon}_\mu$ to be introduced in the βd^-. There is still the *tauonic* ῡ ($\bar{\upsilon}_\tau$), but it does not work either: but for the opposite reasons. The $\bar{\upsilon}_\tau$, in fact, is too massive: it weighs ~15 MeV, i.e. much more than the energy needed to compensate the known energy gap that emerges from the N decay. In the end we have to give up, as we have no known particle that can adequately replace the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ as the 3rd particle of βd^-.
Yet it seems to us a conspicuous contradiction to accept the inclusion of a particle in an equation, with the precise aim of filling the *mass gap,* without solving the problem!
It is widely found in the literature that the maximum mass attributed to $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ corresponds to ≈5.8 eV. How could this particle fill an *energy gap* between 511 and 782 KeV ?!
Nevertheless, βd^- continues to be described in this way, i.e. with the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ as the 3rd particle.

Yet it is known that Pauli and Fermi clearly specified [36] [40] [61] that this 3rd particle should have the same mass of the electron!
Only in this way the *mass gap* emerging from the *N* decay could be compensated. Obviously in this way the equation of βd^-, Eq.(6), was congruous and perfectly balanced.
However, over the years, the idea that ν had a small mass was diffused, a mass increasingly limited, even zero. In fact, by associating it with the Weyl spinor, the SM considered the ν massless.
With an almost null mass, the βd^- equation became increasingly inadequate, incongruous and *unbalanced*, but it was not remedied. Still, the clues to look for a 3rd alternative particle to the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ were all there: it had to be an anti-lepton without an electric charge, and with the same mass of e^-. So why not think that there can also be a *neutral electron* (e°)?
If this particle alternative to ν coincides with an e° (and there would be valid assumptions, as already mentioned in point **2.4.6**), then Eq. (6) should be rewritten as follows:

$$N \rightarrow P + e^- + \bar{e}^\circ \qquad (11).$$

Depending on the acceleration suffered at the time of emission, the energy this different 3rd particle can acquire, should fluctuate, still randomly distributed between 0.78281MeV and 0.511MeV[56].
Also with this solution all the Conservation Laws are brilliantly safeguarded.

2.5 POSSIBLE NUCLEAR ELECTRONS (SAFEGARDING CONSERVATION's LAWS)

As it is known, even before being discovered, the *N* had been imagined as composed of a *P* and an e^- "forming a kind of *neutral doublet*"[1]:

$$N = 〔P , e^-〕 \qquad (12),$$

which is superimposable to the interpretation of Marie Curie (see Eq, 8). Also the main authors who deepened the subject, like Van der Broek [6], Harkins[8], Majorana[24], Pauli[36], Heisemberg [23], etc… had the same idea.
We would like to discuss two topics: the first concerns those real situations in which the e^-, *captured* by a *P*, is not removed, as the HUP would imply; the second is the so-called Spin Statistics.

2.5.1 Real situations in which the *nuclear* e^- is not removed

The particular conditions Rutherford [1] referred to, are actually created in Nature, just in the conditions related to the Baryogenesis, i.e. with the *N Synthesis*: *BB* nucleonic synthesis, *primordial nucleosynthesis*, stellar and explosive nucleosynthesis, *neutronization* and Neutron Stars.

All these situations are united by extreme conditions of density, pressure, gravity and T. What happens is that the atoms are crushed each other, each atom is compressed, so, as in in the case of a hydrogen atom (H_1^1), the orbiting e^- is pushed against its nucleus, that is against a *P*, thus creating a different particle, referred to as *N*, which is made, in fact, by a *P* and an e^-: that is a *neutral P*, as Majorana called it. What has been described is the well known *Neutron Synthesis*, thanks to an *electron capture* mechanism by a free *P*.
To be honest, therefore, we cannot absolutely define this particle, the *N*, as an elementary particle, but a "*complex particle"* [20], without being able to give it a specific identity, that is as an independent

particle. No! Considering how this particle was born, that is from the forced and very close approach, of an e^- with a *P*, we find it more congruous and consistent to define it as *neutral compound (or complex) particle* or *neutral P* , instead of *N*. Thus, without classifying a new baryon particle at all.
The term "*neutral*" is appropriate since the opposite electrical charges, between e^- and *P*, cancel each other out. It is simply a *neutral complex*, exactly corresponding to *Majorana's neutral P*, like the *N model* of Rutherford and Harkins. Thus, these authors had not been mistaken in hypothesizing this nuclear particle, the *N*, *made up* of the forced union of an e^- with a *P*, as occurs widely in Nature, through *electron capture*. An example: "in a Neutron Star, with the radius of 10 km, there are 10^{57} *N*s, as many *N*s as there are in the Sun" [39]. And the cosmos is full of Neutron Stars or *yellow dwarfs*.
Nevertheless, although the reality broadly confirmed that the *N* could be made at least as the *doublet* of Rutherford 〔*P*, e^-〕, it was used, *improperly* in our opinion, the QM, rejecting the hypothesis that the *N* was a *compound particle*, but claiming that the *N* was an *elementary particle*. It means that it was not taken into account that all those physical processes that in Nature produce the *nucleonic synthesis or baryogenesys*, occur exclusively in extreme environmental conditions, where it is widely believed that most of the known physical laws would be less. Weinberg has emphasized widely that, in order to obtain the synthesis of a *P* or a *N*, the T must necessarily be $T \geq 10^{13}$ °K [41].
In short, it deals with really infernal environmental conditions, that is *singular*, as Einstein and many other authors defined them, pointing out, in fact, that in the presence of a *singularity* the physical laws would no longer be valid, or would not take place as usual.
Furthermore, it must be added that this particle, this *compound*, cannot have an internal space. "The e^-_s are so close to the *P*s that they merge with them and there is not even the smallest space between them" [94]. How could this *complex particle* have its own internal space, and thus its radius, given the likely null distance between e^- and *P*? Just think that in only one cm^2 of the *neutronic flux* (which is the core of a Neutron Star) there are 10^{22} *Ns*!
It may seem really ridiculous to keep talking about *N's radius* in these spaces.
Therefore, in Nature the so-called *N* comes from the union of an e^- with a *P*: *Baryogenesis docet*. However, the QM does not allow these conditions to persist, as the e^- would be immediately expelled from the nucleus. In fact, when applying the HUP, an e^- located within the radius (*R*) of the atomic nucleus -see Eq.(7)- would have a *mometum*, an energy (Δ_p) of more than 2 orders of magnitude greater than that of a common *β ray* (≈1 MeV), because:

$$\Delta_p \approx \hbar / R \approx 140 \text{ MeV} \quad (13).$$

Maybe the mentioned HUP example can be valid for a free *N*, i.e. not firmly bound in an atomic nucleus (nor subject to that enormous pressure), so much so that in the average time of ≈ 885 seconds this *N* decays spontaneously. On the contrary, the *N*s housed in the nuclei are made stable by the action of the SNF and by the *nuclear binding energy* [95], so they behave differently (they do not decay).
Moreover, in Nature does not always happen that the e^- is immediately removed (as a result of the HUP) after the *N* is formed: *Neutron Stars testify*, whose *N*s survive for many millions of years. These

stars are a clear example in which the removal of the e^- by the HUP is not carried out: it is reality! That is, in various situations of extreme density, T, gravity and pressure, tending to the *singularities*, the basic principles of the QM, like the HUP, are not applicable. These situations of extreme physical conditions could hide another *Physycs* (also containing other laws), as well as making possible the coexistence of the so-called *nuclear* e^-.

In short, it seems very important to underline that, in these very special circumstances, in our opinion, the considered e^- is not at all located in the nuclear space, as in *Heisemberg's Isospin space* [23] (in this case, it would be expelled by the HUP) but, for a process of *electron capture* operated by *P*, the e^- remained *glued* to the *P*, but without constituting a real self-contained particle, with its internal space and its radius.

Therefore, one could infer that the HUP, and thus the related Eqs.(7) or (13), would not be applicable to all those *N*s (or *neutral complex particles*) created in the various processes that occur spontaneously in Nature, described with the Baryogenesis.

Thus, these *N*s are not at all comparable to an atomic nucleus, with relative radius (*R*), where it is obvious that we would witness the immediate removal of e^- by the HUP. No! The extreme conditions of density (10^{14}g/cm^3) that crushed the e^- against the *P*, thus creating a *neutral compound P*, referred to as *N*, make it impossible to look for the radius (*R*) of this *compound*, given the null distances between e^- and *P*: we are talking about a degenerate gas of *N*s, which creates a *neutron flux* where we count a number of *N*s=10^{22}/cm^2 per second.

How could all these particles ever have their own space and their own *ray* ?!

These observations should also resolve the objection raised by Klein to the notion of an e^- confined within a nucleus (*Klein paradox*) [35]. In fact, analyzing Dirac's equation related to the wave function of the e^- [62], Klein pointed out that, for quantum effects, an e^- would have acquired a remarkable energy, with consequent impossibility to remain confined within a nucleus.

The idea of Klein is pertinent if applied in a standard context, but it would not be applicable, for example, in a *degenerate gas of N*s, for which it could never oppose, in our opinion, the proceeding of a *neutronization*. In a *degenerate gas of N*s (constituting the core of the Neutron Stars), not only nucleons, but also e^- acquire relativistic energies. In such circumstances, in fact, the e^-_s that clash with the *P*s have an energy ≈200 MeV[39], sufficient to induce the *electron capture*: $e^-+P \rightarrow N + \nu_e$ as already represented with the Eq.(5). It is easy to infer that the energy acquired by the e^- considered by Klein, corresponding to ≤140 MeV, is lower than the energy transported by the *captured* e^-, so it would never be able to allow the detachment and removal of the e^- from *P*.

The foregoing explains equally and with the same modalities why, in all those extreme environmental conditions, necessary to allow baryogenesis, the QM is not able to expel the e^- and, therefore, to oppose the creation of *N*.

Indeed, it can not be ruled out that, if the HUP had always denied this persistent union between e^- and *P* (basic for the *Neutron Synthesis*), there would not have been a sufficient baryogenesis for the formation of matter and our world.

Furthermore, the *degenerate gas* is at the base of the so-called *Fermi pressure*, which represents a further contribution against the *N-decay* (or βd^-) inside the nucleus since, operating on the basis of the Pauli Exclusion Principle(PEP), any *P* produced by the *N-decay* would not find a free site where to allocate [3]. Indicating with p_d this *degenerate pressure* of the electrons (or *pressure of Fermi*), we have:

$$p_d = 1/5m_e\,(3/8\pi)^{2/3}\,h^2\,n^{5/3} \qquad (14),$$

where m_e is the mass of the $e^-{}_s$, *n* their number, *h* Planck's constant [96]. In comparison, the ordinary pressure (p_o) is: $p_o = 2nkT$(where *k* indicates the Boltzmann constant).

In short, in certain particular physical conditions, close to those of *singularity* described by Einstein (and especially deepened by Penrose and Hawking) [45] [50], the known physical laws do not act, or operate in a different way.

The fact is that the e^-, *captured* in these extreme conditions by the *P*, remains *glued* for hundreds of millions of years, as occurs in the Neutron Stars, despite the HUP or the PEP. "The average density of a Neutron Star is about 10^{14} times higher than that of the Sun. These values are the highest known and are impossible to reproduce experimentally" [54].

Therefore, those various incompatibility conditions between the *nuclear electrons* and the QM would disappear, since they are not applicable to the *neutral complex particle*, or *neutral P*, indicated as *N*, being the latter extremely condensed (beyond every imaginable measure and probably without analogous situations in Nature) and, therefore, without any internal space and, consequently, without any presumed ray (*R*).

To recapitulate, to a very dense and very compact *neutral compound*, or *neutral P*, devoid of an internal space and a ray, QM principles such as HUP would not be applicable. For the same reasons, in these extreme conditions a *Klein Paradox* will never emerge [35], also because the e^- is linked to the *P* by a very high energy, much higher than that explicable by the HUP to remove the e^-: see Eq.(2).

Still in the presence of these *extreme* environmental conditions, we should mention another, very peculiar phenomenon that prevents the extension of quantum-mechanical effects in such circumstances. That is, when in the core of the Neutron Stars the density reaches $4 \cdot 10^{14}$ Kg/m^3, the minimum energy configuration is that in which some *N*s are outside the nuclei. The appearance of such free *Ns* is called the *N*s *dripping* and marks the beginning of a three-component mixture: crystal lattice of *N*s-rich nuclei, non-relativistic free *N*s, and relativistic $e^-{}_s$ [54]. The free *N*s fluid has the impressive property of not being viscous. This can be explained by the *coupling of two N*s *degenerates*, due to the short-range attraction component of the nucleon-nucleon force (*Pairing Interaction*). It seems particularly important to underline this point: "The combination of two fermions (like the *N*s, in fact) is a boson, which is not subject to the PEP restrictions" [54]. Therefore, since the degenerate bosons can *all* occupy the lowest energy state, the coupled *N*s fluid can not lose any energy. It is a *superfluid* that flows without friction. Any vortex or turbulence inside the fluid will continue to exist forever, without stopping. As density increases, the number of free *N*s increases, whereas that of $e^-{}_s$ decreases. The degeneration pressure of the *N*s exceeds that of the e^- when the density is ~ $4{\cdot}10^{15}$kg/m^3. Near the center of the star, the nuclei dissolve and the distinction between *N*s internal and external to the nuclei becomes devoid of any meaning: *N*s, *P*s and e^-_s are thus free. The *P*s also mate, forming a *superconductive fluid* with zero electrical resistance. The ratio *N*s:*P*s:e^-_s reaches the limit value of 8:1:1, as can be determined by the balance between the *electron capture* process and the *β-decay,* inhibited by the presence of degenerate e^-_s [54].

2.5.2 Spin Statistics

It is known that, as explained in point **2.2**, the Rasetti experiment [34] unquestionably clarifies that the nucleus of the nitrogen (N_7^{14}) has an even atomic mass, being A=14, so the nitrogen spin is part of the *Bose-Eintein Spin Statistics* (integer spin). As a result, nitrogen behaves like a boson. So, this experiment brings down the whole *N model* built by Rutherford, Harkins, Van den Broek, Heisemberg, Majorana, etc. Even Wigner shared this model, so much so that he wrote: "The only elementar particle are the *P* and the e^{-}"[97], thus excluding the *N* from elementary particles.

Therefore the Rutherford and Harkins *N model* is no more valid since, if we add 7 e^-_s in the nucleus of the nitrogen, we have 21 fermions (7 *Ps* settling + 7 *P*s linked to the 7 *captured* e^-_s), i.e. an odd number, from which emerges that nitrogen is a fermion, thus falling within the *Spin Statistics of Fermi-Dirac*(half-integer spin). But this is in stark contrast to the Rasetti experiment, from which it emerges without doubt that the nitrogen spin is an even number: it is a boson. And so it is.

Faced with the evidence, Fermi abandons that *N model* and elaborates his mathematical formalism of the *N decay* (see Eq.6), also including the 3rd particle hypothesized by Pauli. He says: "With the aim of understanding the possibility of emission of *β* rays, we will attempt to construct a theory of the emission of light particles from a nucleus in analogy with the theory of a quantum of light from an excited atom in the usual process of radiation. In the theory of radiation, the total number of the light quanta is not constant; the quanta are created when being emitted from an excited atom and disappear when absorbed"[40]. Likewise, Iwanenko writes: "The expulsion of an e$^-$ is similar to the birth of a new particle" [22]. At the same time, Perrin writes: "The ν does not pre-exist in the atomic nucleus, it is created at the time of emission, like the photon" [98].

In analogy with the will try to establish the theory of *β* rays on these assumptions, Fermi adds:

"a) The total number of e^-_s and ν_s is not necessarily constant.

b) e^-_s (or ν_s) can be created or destroyed. Such a possibility does not have any analogy with the possibility of creation or annihilation of an e$^-$ e$^+$ pair; if, indeed, a e$^+$ is interpreted as a Dirac ≪hole≫, we can simply view the latter process as a quantum transition of an e$^-$ from a state of negative energy to one with positive energy, with conservation of the total (infinite) number of e^-_s.

c) Heavy particles, *N* and *P*, can be considered, according to Heisenberg, as two different quantum states of a heavy particle. We shall formulate this by introducing an internal coordinate (*p*) for the heavy particle, which can take only two values: $p = +1$, if the particle is a *N*; $p = -1$, if the particle is a *P*.

d) The Hamiltonian of the entire system, consisting in heavy and light particles, has to be chosen so that every transition of a *P* into a *N* occurs together with the creation of an e$^-$ and a ν. Notice that in this way electric charge conservation is guaranteed"[65].

In short, the novelty lies in the fact that Fermi asserts that, similarly to the processes of Quantum-Electro-Dynamics (QED), both e^- and *ν* do not pre-exist within the atomic nucleus, but are *created* with the *N decay*. Fermi, therefore, is inspired by the photon: a particle created at the emission of light, and destroyed when the light is absorbed [98]. Already in 1927, in fact, Jordan and Klein had shown that the formalism of QED could be applied to the creation and absorption of any particles, e^- included [64]. The formalism of quantized fields proposed by Jordan and Klein naturally allowed the translation of the language of the fields into the language of particles, and *vice versa*.

Nothing to add: e^-_s can not be in the nucleus.

Yet we have the feeling that something is not matching. Let's analyze, for example, the Eq. (5): $e^-+P\rightarrow N+\nu_e$, which describes the known *electron capture* (*inverse β decay*, *βd*$^+$), or *neutronization* process, we find that it is not unbalanced, as the represented e^- is highly energetic, amply compensating for the mass gap between *P* and *N*. In fact, "This process is established when the energy of the free *degenerate* e^- is so high to balance the defect mass between *P* and *N* in the supernatural material, so to make this reaction more favorable"[57].

We believe, however, that in Eq. (5) there is no description of one or more intermediate steps. We wonder: where does the ν_e come from, placed at the right member? In fact, it is well known that when a particle is created from scratch, i.e. when a new particle materializes, its antiparticle is simultaneously generated. Likewise, a fundamental rule of Physics states that "matter and antimatter particles are always produced as a couple"[99], it's unequivocal! And so: what happened to the relative antiparticle of ν_e, i.e. the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$, which not represented in Eq.(5)? Where is it?

Even before looking for the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$, we must try to understand how it was produced. Since the e^- *captured* by *P* is highly energetic, it should be highly probable that, violently clashing against *P*, this e^- has been lightened of a significant amount of energy, freed in the form of EMR, which can be represented by γ photons. This EMR, therefore, can materialize in *a couple* $\nu_e\ \bar{\upsilon}_e$ [39]. That is:

$$e^- \rightarrow e^- + \gamma \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\upsilon}_e. + \nu_e \qquad (15),$$

where e^- represents the highly energetic electron that will be *captured* by *P*.

It is known that when a star is in the gravitational compression phase, the *matter neutronization* can start, which starts when the density reaches 10^7g/cm^3 and the T exceeds the threshold values necessary for the materialization of e–s and nucleons [41]. In such circumstances, therefore, the EMR consists of highly energetic γ photons which, according to Weinberg's calculations [41], should carry an energy of at least between 1 and 10 MeV, which is enough to generate a couple of electrons or νs (a particle-antiparticle pair). From "another series of reactions, which can describe the Production of Couples, we extract the following reaction:

$$e^- + \gamma \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\upsilon}_e. + \nu_e \qquad (16),$$

this reaction is known as *Photo-annihilation*. It should be noted that in the *electron capture* reactions only ν_e are produced [39]. Eq.(16) is described in the main Astrophysics Treaties, as *photoannihilation* represents one of the most widespread and frequent physical processes of 'Production of Couples' (in this case the couple $\nu_e\ \bar{\upsilon}_e$).

The result of the *materialization* of the EMR, described by Eq.(16), is the same as that illustrated in Eq.(15). Therefore, by integrating these values into Eq. (5), we have:

$$e^{-}+P \rightarrow e^{-}+P+\gamma \rightarrow e^{-}+P+\bar{\upsilon}_{e}.+\nu_{e} \rightarrow N+\nu_{e} \qquad (17),$$

that is:

$$e^{-}+P+\bar{\upsilon}_{e}.+\nu_{e} \rightarrow N+\nu_{e} \qquad (18).$$

In this way, with these two intermediate steps, the previous Eq.(5), describing the *electron capture*, should be, in our opinion, more complete and congruous, since the possible steps through which the ν_e is generated are shown in Eq.(18). Furtermore, considering just the *photoannihilation*, which occurs continuously during the *Neutronization* process, something new emerges.
In this regard, omitting the ν_e, which immediately goes away(present on both side of Eq.18), according to the first Equivalence Principle (of Equations) we obtain an equivalent equation:

$$e^{-}+P+\bar{\upsilon}_{e}. \leftrightarrow N \qquad (19),$$

where it is easy to notice that the N corresponds a compound of 3 particles: $e^{-}+P+\bar{\upsilon}_{e}$, i.e. a *multiplet* $[e^{-}, P, \bar{\upsilon}_{e}]$. The *N*, that is, no longer results as an elementary particle, or a *doublet*, but a *multiplet:*

$$N = [\, e^{-}, P, \bar{\upsilon}_{e} \,] \qquad (20).$$

We would like to point out that the emerged *multiplet* is not a *forcing* at all. It comes from a more complete consideration of the "series of reactions that develop during the collapse of a Neutron Star" [39]: that is considering both "the *Neutronization* processes, such as the electron capture "[39] described with Eq.(5), and "the *Couple Production* processes, including *photoannihilation*"[39], described within Eq.(16).
It is precisely the *photoannihilation* which helps us to better understand these peculiar phenomena in all their complexity. In fact, with the *photoannihilation* we have found the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ which is missing in the *electron capture* equation, where only the ν_e is described, but without the counterpart.
And where is the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$? The $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ is present in the left hand-side of Eq.(18) together with *P* and e^-, arranged in sequence, one after the other, to form that *multiplet*, represented by *N*. In this way, also implying the presence of a couple $\nu_e\, \bar{\upsilon}_e$ (generated by *photoannihilation*), and allocable to the 1st member of (5), this equation becomes more appropriate and physically more valid.

It is interesting to note that the components of the *multiplet* corresponding to *N* (Eq. 20) are exactly the same products hypothesized by Pauli and Fermi for the decay of *N* (see Eq.6), providing an authoritative evidence of path with which Eqs.(17), (18) and(19) were reached.
Moreover, the presence of $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ in Eq.(18) should not appear *misplaced*, since the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ was created together with its relative particle, the ν_e, just as imposed by the most basic rules of Physics [98] and as occurs, precisely, with *photoannihilation*: see Eq.(16).
But, then, one could object: with the Rasetti experiment [34] it has been clearly demonstrated that the nucleus of nitrogen has even spin, so it must have even *atomic mass*. Therefore, the nuclear Spin Statistics categorically excludes the presence of *nuclear* e^-_s and also imposes the *N* as an elementary particle (if we do not consider the quarks). Thus, the hypothesis of the *Neutron multiplet* (*N multiplet*), containing nuclear e^-_s can not stand: it is wrong!
And yet, if we observe with attention we notice that the *N multiplet*, shown with Eq.(19), is different from Rutherford's *N model*, represented by the *doublet* described in Eq.(12).

With the *N multiplet*, things change drastically because its components are 3 fermions, not 2 as in *doublet*. It follows that *N* keeps its spin ½ value, so that this *multiplet* safeguards the Law of Conservation of the Angular Momentum of the *N*.

As is known, the *neutronization* process takes place in the core of massive stars, creating a truly amazing concentration of *N*s: $10^{22}/cm^2$. All these *N*s, which will constitute all the heavy elements, have been formed by *electron capture*, that is, by the very close union of an e^- with a *P*, as shown in Eq.(5).

As previously discussed and shown with Eq.(18), inserting the *Production of Couples* process within Eq.(5), related to *electron capture*, we provide a congruous and, probably, more complete explanation both of the presence of ν_e (in Eq.5) and of the presence of the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ in the *multiplet* describing the *N*. In this case, we reiterate, the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ is *captured*, together with e^-, by the *P* (as illustrated to the 1st member of Eq.18), forming the *multiplet* shown with the Eq. (19).

One could still object: why $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ is always *captured*, whereas the ν_e (also present at the 1st member of Eq.18) is always let go? Why we sometimes do not have the opposite? It is simple: it is imposed by the Law of Conservation of the Lepton Number (L). Given that the *P*, being a baryon has L=0, this value will have to remain constant, though the whole course of the *electron capture* process. This process allows the *P* to *hook* tightly an e^-, the latter having L=1. It is easy to see that if the *electron capture* process stopped with the *capture* of only e^-, and so it is described (as shown by Eq. 5), the *N* coming from this union (e^- with *P*) , would have L=1 (as well as becoming a boson!). But it is absurd. It is impossible: *N* is a baryon, so it will always have L=0. So where is the mistake? In leaving the equation related to *electron capture* as it has been described. Instead, if we consider that a 3rd particle is also *captured*, things could adjust, provided that this particle has L = –1. But only an anti-lepton has L = –1. This is why the ν_e is let go (with it, moreover, *N* would come to L = 2), while the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ is *captured*!

This 3rd particle is exactly the same Pauli proposed in βd^- [36], which is just the inverse process of *electron capture*, called namely *inverse βd* (or βd^+).

In addition, if composed of 3 particles *N* returns to be a fermion.

Now let's look at the Spin Statistics of the Nitrogen nucleus (N_7^{14}), considering *N* as *multiplet* (rather than *doublet*). This particular changes things.

With the model of the *N multiplet*, we have that in the nucleus of nitrogen to the 7 base *Ps*, as a result of the e*lectron capture* process more 7 *Ps* are added, as well as 7 e^-_s and 7 $\bar{\upsilon}_e$.

So in the nitrogen nucleus we have as many as 28 half-integer spin particles (fermions). Thus, summing up, we have an even spin, which tells us that the nucleus of nitrogen behaves like a boson, in perfect agreement with the perplexities raised by Heitler-Herzberg [31] and by Ornstein and van Vijk [32], with Kronig's intuitions [33] and with the Rasetti experiment [34]. And above all, according to reality.

Nonetheless, this *N multiplet*, proposed in this way, does not satisfy us completely, since, observing Eq.(20), we notice that something is wrong. In fact, to equalize the mass of the 1st member, i.e. of the *N*, the 3rd particle placed at the 2nd member, i.e. the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$, should weigh between 0.78281MeV and

0.511MeV. But then, as the mass of the ν_e is considered to be small, it takes from ~ 100000 to 250000 $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ to balance the equation. Therefore, it does not work, it is unthinkable: it must be a different particle to compensate for the mass.

Unless we think, as we have already hypothesized to try to solve the mass gap problem of βd^-, that this 3rd particle is not a $\bar{\upsilon}_e$, but another particle, still unknown. Having to respect, however, also the Law of Conservation of the Lepton Number, this 3rd particle must be obligatorily an antilepton, and of null electric charge. These are 2 of the 3 requests put forward by Pauli and Fermi [36] [40] [65] to characterize the 3rd particle of βd^-.

Their 3rd request is that it had the same mass of e^-[36][61]. Therefore, a neutral antilepton, with the mass of e^-, immediately made us think of a *neutral electron*: e°, or rather an anti-e° (ē°). In this case, the *multiplet* corresponding to the *N* would be as follows:

$$N = [\, e^-, P\,,\ \bar{e}^\circ \,] \qquad (21).$$

In order to counterbalance the mass of *N*, the ē° must have a mass between 0.78281MeV and 0.511MeV, values easily reached with sufficient acceleration.

Also this *multiplet* is completely superimposable to the products of the *N* decay, with the substitution of the $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ with ē°, as proposed with Eq.(11).

3. CONCLUSIONS

Somebody may say: even with the *N*, considered as an elementary particle, we are in agreement with the Rasetti experiment, thus there is no need to puzzled about building the model of the *Neutron multiplet.* In our opinion, as explained above, the *N multiplet* solves some unsolved problems, as well as making some equations complete and congruous.

First of all, it gives the right role to the *photoannihilation* reactions, describing them together with the *electron capture*, we understand the fate of couples like ν_e $\bar{\upsilon}_e$, an *implicit* couple, in our opinion, the 1st member of Eq. (5), however not shown. As well as we can better understand the presence (otherwise unexplained) of ν_e at the 2nd member of the same equation.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the *N multiplet* is completely identical, both structurally and in mass-energy content, to the products of the *N decay*, or βd^-, including the 3rd particle.

Finally, if we considered the possible existence of the e°, with relative antiparticle, instead of ν, we would actually and in all respects, in a more appropriate and elegant manner, safeguard the Law of Mass and Energy Conservation, both in the *N decay* and in the *N multiplet*.

Moreover, the ē°, if present in the *N multiplet*, with its neutrality could likewise play a precious *cementing* role, thus contributing to the stability over time of this *multiplet*, i.e. similar to the role of stability played by *Ns* within the atomic nuclei.

Harkins suggested the existence, in the nucleus, of "two *cementing* electrons" [8].

Nor should the novelty emerging from our model be omitted, since *N* would no longer exist as an autonomous elementary particle, with its own individual identity. In our opinion, rather than *N*, it would be appropriate to define it, mentioning Majorana, *neutral P* or *complex particle*. That is, with the *multiplet* we would not have a *N*, but 3 different particles, tightly joined together: [e^-, *P*, $\bar{\upsilon}_e$].

Moreover, the *multiplet* reflects, in reverse, the three products of the *N* decay in which only one $\bar{\upsilon}_e$ can not compensate for the mass gap problem of βd^-: it would take from 100000 to 250000 of these ν_s to compensate for the gap.
On the contrary, a single e° would be enough to balance the gap mass, so that the *N multiplet* would be more congruous if formulated in this way: $N = [e^-, P, \bar{e}°]$, i.e. as in Eq. (21).
This would take to a considerable simplification of SM, since there would be a single type of particle between the baryons (that is, among the hadrons of the 1st family), i.e. the *P*, and a single type of particles between the leptons of the 1st family, represented precisely by the electron in its forms: e^-, e^+, e° and ē°. In conclusion: the 1st Family of the Hadrons would be represented only by the proton, whereas the 1st Family of Leptons would be represented only by the electron.

4. REFERENCES

1. Sir E. Rutherford, "Bakerian Lecture: Nuclear Constitution of Atoms", Proceed.Roy.Soc. A,XCVII,Vol.97, Issue 686,374-400, 1th July 1920.
2. Becquerel H., "Sur les radiations emises par phosphorence", Comptes Rendus, 122, 420-421, 1896.
3. Maiani L., "Isotopes and nuclear electrons", Fermi Lectures 4, INFN, Rome, 27th November 2014.
4. Sir E. Rutherford, "The Building up the Atoms", Proceed. of British Association,25/8/1920, "Engineering", 110,382,1920.
5. Van den Broek A.J., "Das α-Teilchen und das periodische System der Elemente, Annalen der Physik, 328,23, 199-203,1907.
6. Van den Broek A.J., "On nuclear electrons", Philosophical Magazine,27,455-467,1914.
7. Van den Broek A.J., "Atomic models and regions of intra-atomic electrons", Nature, 93,7-8,1914.
8. Harkins W.D.,"The Stability of Atoms as Related to the Positive and Negative Electrons in their Nuclei, and the Hidrogen, Helium, H_3,H_2,Theory of Atomic Structure", J. Americ. Chem. Soc., 32, 1956-1997, 1920.
9. De Gregorio A., "Il Protone Neutro", ovvero della laboriosa esclusione degli elettroni dal nucleo, Tesi di Dottorato in Fisica, Univerità di Roma La Sapienza, 2005.
10. Sir E. Rutherford, "Structure of the Radioactive Atom and Origin of the α-Rays", Philosophical Magazine, vol. 4,580-605,1927.
11. Brandinelli L., "La Scoperta del Neutrone", Tesi di Laurea in Fisica, Università di Bologna, Italia, 2017.
12. Bothe W.W., Becker H., "Künstliche Erregung von Kern -γ-Strahlen" ,Zeitschrift für Physik, LXVI, 289-306, 1930.
13. Webster H.C., "The Artificial Production of Nuclear γ-Radiation" , Proc. Roy. Soc.,London,Vol.136, 427-453, 1932.
14. Pascolini A., 1932 *annus mirabilis* della fisica/infn.it
15. Curie I., Joliot F., "Émission de protons de grande vitesse par les substances hydrogénées sous l'influence des rayons γ trés penetrants",Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences, 194, 273-275, 1932.
16. Amaldi E., "La vita e l'opera di Ettore Majorana (1906-1938)", Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, XXII, 1966.
17. Segrè E. in "E. Fermi, Collected Papers", Chicago, the University of Chicago Press, 1962-65, vol. I, page 488, 1962.
18. file:///C:/Users/Scopertadel neutrone.html
19. Chadwick J., "Possible Existence of a Neutron", Nature, Vol.129, No.3252, page 312, February 27, 1932.
20. Chadwick J., "The Existence of a Neutron", Proc.Roy.Soc.,London, Vol.136, 692-708,1932.
21. Recami E., "Ettore Majorana: l'opera scientifica edita ed inedita", Percorsi,Il Nuovo Saggiatore,15,14-28,1999.
22. Ivanenko D., "The Neutron Hypothesis", Nature, 129, April 21 1932.
23. Heisenberg W.,"Über den Bau der Atomkerne. I", Zeitschrift für Physik, 77, 1-11, June 7 1932.

24. Majorana E., “Uber die Kerntheorie”, Zeitschrift fur Physik, 82, 137-145, 1933.
25. Majorana E., “Sulla Teoria dei Nuclei”, La Ricerca Scientifica, Vol.4,1,559-565, 1933.
26. Fermi E., Lazzarino O., Persico E., Polvani G., Carrelli A., lettera inviata al Ministro della Pubblica Istruzione, conservata presso l’Archivio Centrale dello Stato Italiano: *Serie* ‘Istruzione’; *Fascicolo*: Ettore Majorana, 25 Ottobre 1937.
27. Gamow G.A., “Atmonoe Yadro i Radioaktiun ost”, GIZ Edit., Moscow and Leningrad, 1930.
28. Gamow G., “Structure of Atomic Nucleus and Nuclear Tranformations”, Clarendon Press, Oxford, U.K., 1st edition with Preface by Lord Rutherford, Dec. 14 1931.
29. Gamow G., “Uber den heutigen Stand der Theorie des β-Zerfalls”, Phys. Zeit., 35, 533-542, 1934.
30. Gamow G., “Nuclear Spin of Radioactive Elements”, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, London, 146, 217-222, 1936.
31. Heitler W.,Herzberg G.,“ Gehorchen die Stickstoffkerne der Boseschen Statistik?”,Naturwissenschaften, XVII, 673-674,1929.
32. Ornstein L.S., van Wijk W.R., “Untersuchungen über das negative Stickstoffbandenspektrum”, Zeitschrift für Physik, IL,315-322, 1928.
33. Kronig R., “Der Drehimpuls des Stickstoffkerns”, Naturwissenschaften, 16, 335, 1928.
34. Rasetti F, “Alternating Intensities in the Spectrum of Nitrogen”, Nature, CXXIV, 792-793, 1932.
35. Klein O., “Die Reflexion von Elektronen an einem Potentialsprung nach der relativistischen Dynamik von Dirac”, Zeitschrift fur Physik, Vol.53,Issue 3-4,157-165,1929.
36. Pauli W., Letter to partecipants of the Conference in Tubingien(1930),Septiem Conseil de Physique Solvay, 6th December 1930.
37. Heisemberg W.,“Uber den anscauliken Inhalt der Quantentheoritschen Kinematik und Mechanik“, Zeitschrift fur Physik,Vol.43,172-198,1927.
38. Puccini A., “Uncertainty Principle and Electromagnetic Waves”, Journal of Electromagnetic Waves and Applications, Vol.19, Issue 7, 885-890,2005.
39. www.Fe.INFN.it/florenti/courses/astrophysics/07/Supernovae
40. Fermi E., “Tentativo di una teoria dell’emissione dei raggi β”,La Ricerca Scientifica ,4,491-495, 1933.
41. Weinberg S., “The First Three Minutes. A Modern View of the Origin of the Universe”,©1977 by S. Weinberg; Mondadori Ed.(Milano),1977, 172-173,125,93,117.
42. Puccini A., “About the Zero Point Energy, Zero Point Mass, Zero Point Temperature and Zero Point Motion in the Subatomic World and Photonics”, Progress In Electromagnetics Research Symposium Proceedings, Suzhou, China, Sept. 12-16, 2011, 1169-1171.
43. Hawking, S., “A Brief History of Time”,©1988 by Stephen W. Hawking, Bantan Books ed.; Rizzoli ed.,Milano,67,1990.
44. Puccini A., “Correct Quantum Gravity is a Mechanical Effect Induced by Dynamic-Mass of Light’s Quanta”, viXra.org., Quantum Gravity and String Theory, 1712.0546, 2017.
45. Penrose R., “Gravitational collapse and space-time singularities”, Phys.Rev.Lett.,14,3,57-59, 1965.
46. Hawking S.W., “Particle creation by black holes”, Commun. Math. Phys., 43, 199-220,1975.
47. Puccini A., “About the Specific Heat of Black Holes” (Session 3P1: Optics and Photonics). Progress in Electromagnetics Research Symposium Proceedings , Cambridge (Ma), USA, July 5-8, 2010, 816-818.
48. Pacini F., “L’Universo. Pianeti stelle galassie”, Editori Riuniti, Roma, 280,286,287,1982.
49. Hawking S.W., “Blach holes and thermodynamics”, Phys.Rev.,D,13,2,191, 1976a.
50. Hawking S.W., Penrose R., “The Singularities of gravitational collapse and cosmology”, Proc.Roy.Soc.of London, A, 314, 529-548,1970.
51. Puccini A., “Dark Matter Particle is a Neutral Electron”, viXra.org, Astrophysics, 1707.0364, 2017.
52. Maiani L.,“Fusione nucleare nelle stelle di grande massa”, Fermi Lectures 10, INFN Rome,15th Jan. 2015
53. Chandrasekhar S., “The Maximum Mass of Ideal White Dwarfs”, Astrophysical J.,vol.74,81-82, 1931.
54. Marani A:, “Stelle di Neutroni”, Tesi di Laurea in Matematica e Fisica ,Università di Bologna,2008.
55. Marconi A., “Fondamenti di Astrofisica “, Lesson 9, Anno Accademico 2010/2011, Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, University of Florence, Italy..
56. Puccini A., “Neutral Electron instead of Neutrino: a New Beta-Decay Model”, viXra.org, Nuclear and Atomic Physics, 1707.0364, 2017.
57. de Grenet L., “L’evoluzione delle stelle”//archive.oapd.inaf.it
58. Tolman R.C., “Static Solutions of Einstein’s Field Equations for Spheres of Fluid”, Phys.Rev.,55,374, 364-373, 1939.
59. Oppenheimer J.R., Volkoff G.M., “On Massive Neutron Cores”, Phys.Rev.,55,374, 374-381, 1939.

60. Klein E., “Il etait sept fois la revolution”, 2005, ed.Flammarion; Cortina ed.(Milano),139, 2006.
61. Fermi E., “Le ultime particelle costitutive della materia”, 22° Meeting Società Italiana per la Propensione delle Scienze (SIPS), Bari 13/10/1933; Proceedings SIPS, Roma , Vol.2, 7-14, 1934.
62. Dirac P.A.M., “The Quantum Theory of the Electron”, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, London,117,610-624,1928.
63. Dirac P.A.M., “The Quantum Theory of the Electron. Part II”, Proc. Roy. Soc. A, London, 118,351-361,1928.
64. Jordan P., Klein O., “Zum Mehrkörperproblem der Quantentheorie”, Zeitshrift fur Phys.,45,751,1927.
65. Fermi E., “An Attempt at a Theory of βRays”, Nuovo Cimento, 11, 1-19, 1934.
66. Feynman R.P,, “QED”, ©1985 by Richard P. Feynman; Adelphi ed.(Milano),164,183,1989.
67. Noether E., “Invariante variationprobleme”, Math.-phys. Klasse, 235-257, 1918.
68. Weyl H., “Gravitation und Elektrizital”, Sitzungsber Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin,465,480,1918.
69. Quirantes A., “Lo Spazio-Tempo Quantistico”,©2015 RBA,Contenidos ed., Spagna;© RBA Italia,Milano,2016,78-79.
70. Maiani L., “Sessant’anni di Yang-Mills”, Il Nuovo Saggiatore,31,5-6,22-32,2015.
71. Pauli W., “Zur Theorie der Gravitation und der Elektrizitat von Hermann Weyl”, Physikalische Zeitschrift, vol.20,457-467,1919.
72. Sparzani A., Introduction in “Relativitatstheorie” by Wolfgang Pauli in “Encyklopadie der mathematischen Wissenschaften”,Teubner, Leipzig 1921,vol.5,pt.2,art.19,Bollati Boringhieri ed., Torino, 1958, 1974 e 2008,XXI.
73. Pauli W., “Merkurperihelbewegung und Strahlenablenkung in Weyls Gravitationstheorie”, Verhandhungen def Deutschen Phisikalischen Gesellschaft, vol.21, 742-750, 1919.
74. Weyl H.,“Elektron und Gravitation”, Zeitschrift fur Physik, 56, 330-352, 1929.
75. Nambu Y..and Jona-Lasinio G.,“Dynamical Model of Elementary Particles Based on an Analogy with Superconductivity.I”, Phys.Rev.,122,345-358,1961.
76. Nambu Y..and Jona-Lasinio G.,“Dynamical Model of Elementary Particles Based on an Analogy with Superconductivity.II”, Phys.Rev.,124,246-254,1961.
77. Goldstone J., “Field theories with ‘Superconductor’ solutions”, Il Nuovo Cimento,19,1,154-164,1961.
78. Goldstone J., Salam A. and Weinberg S., “Broken Symmetries”, Phys.Rev., 127,965-970,1962.
79. Maiani L., “Conservazione del numero barionico”, Fermi Lectures 25, INFN, Rome, 16th April 2015.
80. Maiani L., “Teoria Standard alle temperature del Big Bang”, Fermi Lectures 24, INFN, Rome, 20th March 2014.
81. Fukuda S. et al., "Evidence for Oscillation of Atmospheric Neutrinos", Pyys.Rev.Lett.,81,1562,1998.
82. Vissani F., “La Domanda di Majorana”, Ithaca: Viaggio nella Scienza,2015,VI,47-57.
83. Mirizzi A., “Neutrini e Supernovae”, Ithaca: Viaggio nella Scienza,2015,VI,69-74.
84. Maiani L. “La massa dei neutrini”, Fermi Lectures 23, INFN, Rome, 26th March 2015.
85. Puccini A., “Lightest Supersymmetric Particle is a Self-Conjugated Neutral Electron”, viXra.org, Nuclear and Atomic Physics, 1707.0243, 2017.
86. Randall L., “Knocking on Heaven’s Door”, ©Lisa Randall 2011-2012; il Saggiatore ed.(Milano), 256, 2012.
87. Puccini A., “On the Boson’s Range of the Weak Nuclear Force”, viXra.org, Nuclear and Atomic Physics, 1705.0351, 2017.
88. Maiani L., “Hot Dark Matter: i 3 neutrini leggeri”, Fermi Lectures 17, INFN, Rome, 12th February 2015.
89. Puccini A., “Majorana Particle is a Neutral Self-Conjugated Electron”, viXra.org, Nuclear and Atomic Physics, 1707.0064, 2017.
90. Reines F. and Cowan C.L., “The Neutrino”, Nature, vol.178, 446-449, September 1,1956.
91. 91)Cherenkov A., “Visible emission of clean liquids by action of ϒ radiation”, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR, 2,451,1934.
92. Puccini A., “Why Gamma Photons Induce Cherenkov Effect”, Progress in Electromagnetics Research Symposium Proceedings, Moskow, Russia, August 19-23, 2012, 343-347.
93. Puccini A., “Quantum Mechanics Suggests that Photons with Different Energy Do Not Travel at the Same Speed”, Progress in Electromagnetics Research Symposium Proceedings, Marrakesh, Morocco, Mar. 20-23, 2011, 729-733.
94. http://archive.oapd.INAF.it/Stelle_di_neutroni.html
95. www.Fe.infn/Reazioni nucleari di interesse astrofisico/03.
96. www.uniroma2.it/didattica/ELASTRO1/cap.4.pdf

97. Wigner E.P., “On the Mass Defect of Helium”, Physical Review, Vol.43, 252-257,1932.
98. Perrin J.B., cited by Bonolis L. “Fermi e la teoria del decadimento beta”, Roma 1,INFN.it, 29 Nov.-4 Dec. 2004.
99. http://scienzapertutti.Inf.infn/0407-materia-e-antimateria