

Antiparticles

The Inversion Hidden Inside Matter

From Dirac's equation to the Omega Inversion Principle

One question:

What is the antiparticle if reality is a state-space
of distinctions?

Nick Rugai
5 October 2026

Companion manuscript to *Theory of Everything - All Is Epistemic*
Working monograph - established physics separated from TOE conjecture

Status, scope, and the one dangerous distinction

This manuscript has two jobs. First, it states what established particle physics means by an antiparticle: how antiparticles arise, what is known about them, what has been measured, and where the open questions remain. Second, it asks what antiparticles would mean inside the proposed All Is Epistemic TOE.

The first job is physics. The second is conjecture.

Established physics

The existence of antiparticles is established experimentally. The positron was predicted by relativistic quantum mechanics and observed in 1932. Modern quantum field theory contains particle and antiparticle excitations as part of the field description. Matter-antimatter pairs can be produced, bound into anti-atoms and anti-nuclei, and annihilated into other allowed quantum states. [3, 1, 2]

TOE conjecture / model hypothesis

The claim that antiparticles are a manifestation of the TOE's deeper inversion architecture is a model hypothesis. It is not established physics. In particular, the TOE must not identify its Omega Inversion Principle with ordinary charge conjugation by declaration. It must derive the low-energy charge-conjugation structure and recover the observed Standard Model symmetries and violations.

Contents

1	The first surprise: the antiparticle is not negative matter	2
2	Antimatter is a field-theoretic necessity, not a second universe	3
3	Creation: making matter and antimatter from energy	3
4	The laboratory made the mirror real	4
5	The symmetry stack: C, P, T, and CPT	5
6	The subtle part: antiparticles are not time travelers	6
7	The TOE turn: inversion without mythology	6
8	The beautiful interpretation	7
9	What antimatter forces the TOE to respect	8
10	The research target	9
11	No sacred variables	10
	Epilogue: The mirror	10

A Compact reference equations	11
B Selected references and anchors	11

1 The first surprise: the antiparticle is not negative matter

1.1 Dirac opens the door

In 1928, Paul Dirac constructed a relativistic wave equation for the electron. The equation admits both positive- and negative-frequency solutions. The historical interpretation led to the prediction of a positively charged counterpart of the electron, the positron, observed by Carl Anderson in cosmic rays in 1932. [3, 1, 2]

The modern lesson is cleaner than the historical story. A negative-energy “sea” is not required as the fundamental ontology. In quantum field theory, the relativistic field is quantized, and the would-be negative-frequency electron sector is represented by creation operators for positive-energy antiparticle excitations.

For a free Dirac field,

$$(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)\psi = 0. \quad (1)$$

The field expansion contains both sectors schematically as

$$\psi(x) \sim \sum_s \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \left[a_s(\mathbf{p}) u_s(\mathbf{p}) e^{-ip \cdot x} + b_s^\dagger(\mathbf{p}) v_s(\mathbf{p}) e^{+ip \cdot x} \right]. \quad (2)$$

Here $a^\dagger$ creates an electron and $b^\dagger$ creates a positron. Both have positive energy. The antiparticle is therefore not “matter with negative energy.” It is another allowed quantum excitation of the same relativistic field structure.

1.2 What changes and what does not

For a particle and its antiparticle, the mass is the same and the spin magnitude is the same. Additive internal charges reverse sign under charge conjugation. For the electron,

$$e^- : Q = -1, \quad e^+ : Q = +1. \quad (3)$$

For the proton and antiproton,

$$p : (Q, B) = (+1, +1), \quad \bar{p} : (Q, B) = (-1, -1), \quad (4)$$

where B denotes baryon number in the usual particle-physics convention.

The phrase “opposite charge” is therefore too narrow. The correct statement is that the antiparticle carries the conjugate set of relevant additive quantum numbers. Some quantum numbers are not simply reversed labels, and self-conjugate particles exist.

Epistemic interpretation

The essential relation is not

$$\text{matter} \leftrightarrow \text{negative matter}.$$

It is

$$\boxed{\text{state} \leftrightarrow \text{conjugate state}}.$$

The conjugation acts on the representation and its conserved charges while preserving the invariant mass scale and spin magnitude.

2 Antimatter is a field-theoretic necessity, not a second universe

2.1 One field, two orientations of quantum number

A charged complex scalar field provides the simplest illustration. Its quanta can be labeled as particles and antiparticles, with creation operators $a^\dagger$ and $b^\dagger$. A real scalar field does not have an independent antiparticle sector: its excitation is self-conjugate.

The same pattern persists in gauge and fermion theories. A field representation can be complex, giving distinct particle and antiparticle states, or real/pseudoreal in the appropriate sense, allowing self-conjugate excitations. The question is representation-theoretic before it is visual.

This is why the statement “every particle has an antiparticle” is useful but incomplete. The exact statement is:

$$\boxed{\text{Every quantum field admits a charge-conjugate excitation structure.}} \quad (5)$$

For self-conjugate fields, the conjugate excitation is the same physical particle.

2.2 Self-conjugate particles

Photons are their own antiparticles. The Z boson is self-conjugate. The Higgs boson is self-conjugate. The graviton, if it is a quantum excitation of a real metric field, would likewise be self-conjugate. [4]

The non-Abelian gauge sector requires a little more care: gluons live in the adjoint representation, whose representation is real, but individual color labels should not be treated as if they were an electrically neutral “gluon = antigluon” cartoon. The correct statement is about the underlying field representation.

Neutrinos are the famous unresolved case. If neutrinos are Dirac particles, neutrino and antineutrino are distinct. If they are Majorana particles, the neutrino is its own antiparticle. Searches for neutrinoless double-beta decay test this possibility, but no such decay has been observed. The 2026 LEGEND-200 result reported no evidence and set a stronger lower limit on the half-life. [12]

3 Creation: making matter and antimatter from energy

3.1 Pair production

Antiparticles do not require a pre-existing reservoir of antimatter. Relativistic interactions can create a particle-antiparticle pair from energy while conserving the relevant quantum numbers.

The schematic threshold reaction is

$$\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow e^- + e^+, \quad (6)$$

with center-of-mass energy at least sufficient to supply the pair's rest energy,

$$E_{\text{cm}} \geq 2m_e c^2, \quad (7)$$

plus any kinetic energy required by the final state. Direct light-by-light pair creation has been experimentally demonstrated in high-energy nuclear collisions. [5]

In a field-theoretic description, what is conserved is not “matter” as a substance but energy-momentum, gauge charges and other conserved quantum numbers, subject to the symmetries and selection rules of the interaction.

3.2 Annihilation

The reverse process is equally fundamental:

$$e^- + e^+ \rightarrow \gamma + \gamma \quad (8)$$

for a suitable initial state. The pair disappears as particle excitations, but the conserved four-momentum and quantum numbers reappear in the products.

So “annihilation” is not destruction in the philosophical sense. It is a change of basis in the physical state space: the degrees of freedom associated with the incoming excitations are transferred into different outgoing excitations.

For matter-antimatter pairs containing composite hadrons, annihilation can produce many photons, leptons, and hadrons. The detailed final state is governed by quantum field dynamics, available phase space, and conservation laws.

Epistemic interpretation

The clean epistemic picture is almost embarrassingly simple:

$$\boxed{\text{creation} = \text{new distinguishable excitations from an allowed transition}} \quad (9)$$

$$\boxed{\text{annihilation} = \text{those excitations returning their conserved content to other states}} \quad (10)$$

Nothing is “unmade” outside the state-transition algebra.

4 The laboratory made the mirror real

4.1 Anti-atoms and anti-nuclei

The existence of antiparticles is not merely inferred from scattering equations. Antiprotons, positrons and other antiparticles are produced and trapped experimentally. Antihydrogen, consisting of an antiproton bound to a positron, has been produced and trapped long enough for precision spectroscopy and gravity experiments. Anti-deuterons and heavier light anti-nuclei have also been observed in high-energy collisions. [6, 7]

The striking point is that antimatter obeys the same quantum architecture required to assemble structured systems. An anti-atom is not a theatrical reversal of ordinary matter. It is a legitimate bound state built from conjugate constituents.

4.2 Spectroscopy: how close is the mirror?

If CPT symmetry is exact, corresponding particle and antiparticle masses and lifetimes are constrained to match, while charges reverse as appropriate. Experiments have pushed such comparisons to remarkable precision. The BASE collaboration has measured the proton-antiproton charge-to-mass ratio to about 16 parts per trillion consistency with equality in magnitude. [8]

Antihydrogen spectroscopy provides an even more direct comparison of atomic structure. The experimental program is not asking whether antimatter is “similar enough.” It asks whether the mirror is exact at the level demanded by fundamental symmetry.

4.3 Gravity does not get an exception card

General relativity predicts that antimatter should respond to gravity in the same attractive way as matter. In 2023, the ALPHA collaboration reported that trapped antihydrogen falls toward Earth consistently with ordinary attractive gravity, with the experiment’s precision at roughly the 20 percent-of- g level. [9]

That result matters conceptually. There is no established evidence that antimatter possesses antigravity. The burden for any TOE is therefore severe: any deeper inversion mechanism must reduce to the observed gravitational behavior.

5 The symmetry stack: C, P, T, and CPT

5.1 Do not confuse charge conjugation with the whole mirror

Charge conjugation C replaces particles by their antiparticles. Parity P reverses spatial handedness. Time reversal T reverses the direction of time in the symmetry transformation sense. These operations are logically distinct.

The weak interaction violates C and P separately, and nature also violates CP . Nevertheless, local Lorentz-invariant quantum field theories satisfying the standard CPT assumptions obey the combined symmetry

$$\boxed{CPT = \text{exact symmetry of the theory class}} \quad (11)$$

under the usual theorem hypotheses. [4]

This distinction is essential. Antiparticles exist even though C is not an exact symmetry of the full Standard Model. Antiparticle structure is deeper than the statement that nature is perfectly charge-conjugation symmetric.

5.2 Matter-antimatter asymmetry

The Universe presents the opposite puzzle: antimatter is common in the equations and abundant in the early hot universe, yet the observable cosmos is overwhelmingly matter-dominated. The Standard Model contains CP violation, but the known amount is far too small to account for the cosmic baryon asymmetry by itself. [3, 10, 11]

Thus two statements coexist:

$$\text{particle-antiparticle structure} \approx \text{extremely robust}, \quad (12)$$

$$\text{cosmic matter-antimatter equality} \neq \text{what the Universe actually exhibits}. \quad (13)$$

This is not a contradiction. It is one of the great unsolved problems of fundamental physics.

6 The subtle part: antiparticles are not time travelers

The historical interpretation of Dirac's negative-energy solutions and the later Feynman-Stueckelberg language sometimes produce the sentence "an antiparticle is a particle moving backward in time." That sentence is useful inside particular calculations and diagrams, but dangerous if promoted to literal ontology.

In modern quantum field theory, an antiparticle is a positive-energy excitation associated with the conjugate sector of a field. Feynman diagrams can be drawn with reversed time orientation, but physical detectors do not receive little objects arriving from the future. What the theory predicts are amplitudes, states, and correlations satisfying relativistic causality.

Reality veto / falsification requirement

Do not build the TOE on the slogan "antimatter travels backward in time." The safe primitive is field conjugation plus the observed symmetry structure. Any deeper interpretation must reproduce the causal, positive-energy quantum theory in its 4D limit.

7 The TOE turn: inversion without mythology

7.1 The proposal

Now we cross from established physics into the All Is Epistemic hypothesis.

Suppose the fundamental TOE state is represented schematically by

$$|\Sigma\rangle = |\text{distinctions, relations, constraints, state transitions}\rangle, \quad (14)$$

and suppose the microscopic architecture contains a lawful involution

$$\mathcal{I}^2 = 1. \quad (15)$$

A candidate matter-antimatter map is then

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{TOE}} : |\Sigma, Q, \lambda\rangle \longrightarrow |\bar{\Sigma}, -Q, \bar{\lambda}\rangle, \quad (16)$$

where Q denotes the vector of additive charges and λ denotes the remaining representation labels.

The crucial move is conceptual:

$$\boxed{\text{antiparticle} = \text{lawful conjugate state, not independent substance.}} \quad (17)$$

That statement fits the established field picture remarkably well. But it is not yet a derivation.

7.2 The dangerous distinction: OIP is not C

The TOE already contains the Omega Inversion Principle, an inversion at the boundary of the entire epistemic state space. It is tempting to declare

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{OIP}} = C.$$

Do not.

Charge conjugation acts within the physical state space and reverses the appropriate quantum numbers. OIP, as presently formulated, acts at a far deeper architectural boundary: the proposed transition from the maximally undifferentiated Omega sector into a branch with nonzero distinguishability.

They may be related. They are not automatically identical.

A better hypothesis is hierarchical:

Omega inversion $\rightarrow$ microscopic state involution $\rightarrow$ charge conjugation $\rightarrow$ particle-antiparticle structure

(18)

The arrows are research obligations, not established equations.

7.3 What the TOE would need to derive

A real derivation would have to show that the proposed microscopic action admits an involutive operation whose low-energy representation becomes the observed charge-conjugation map. It would need to recover:

$$\mathcal{C}^2 = 1, \tag{19}$$

charge reversal,

$$m_{\bar{a}} = m_a, \tag{20}$$

spin-spectrum matching, the correct conjugate gauge representations, positive-energy excitations, and the observed CPT structure.

Then the theory must also permit the experimentally observed fact that C and P can be violated while the full CPT theorem remains intact under its domain of validity.

8 The beautiful interpretation

8.1 Matter is one branch of a larger state space

The usual picture says that a particle has an antiparticle. The epistemic picture asks the prior question: what structure makes those two states distinguishable in the first place?

Let a physical excitation be a state s in an allowed state manifold Ω_{phys} . Define an involution $\mathcal{C}$ such that

$$\mathcal{C} : \Omega_{\text{phys}} \rightarrow \Omega_{\text{phys}}, \quad \mathcal{C}^2 = 1. \tag{21}$$

The fixed points satisfy

$$\mathcal{C}(s) = s, \tag{22}$$

and correspond to self-conjugate sectors. The paired points satisfy

$$\mathcal{C}(s) \neq s, \tag{23}$$

and form particle-antiparticle pairs.

That gives a compact geometric picture:

$$\boxed{\Omega_{\text{phys}} = \text{paired states} \cup \text{fixed-point states.}} \quad (24)$$

This is where the TOE becomes epistemic rather than merely decorative. A particle and antiparticle are not two unrelated things that happen to annihilate. They are two distinguishable states connected by a lawful transformation inside the same architecture.

8.2 Annihilation as recombination of distinctions

The annihilation process becomes especially clean in this language. Consider a pair $(s, \mathcal{C}s)$. Their additive charges cancel:

$$Q(s) + Q(\mathcal{C}s) = 0. \quad (25)$$

The interaction can therefore map the pair into another allowed state s' carrying the same conserved total quantities:

$$(s, \mathcal{C}s) \xrightarrow{U} s'. \quad (26)$$

The pair has not fallen out of reality. Its distinguishable content has been reorganized.

Epistemic interpretation

This is the point worth keeping:

Annihilation is not the deletion of a thing. It is the lawful collapse of one representation of conserved structure into another.

The word “annihilation” describes the disappearance of the particle labels, not the disappearance of the physical transition.

8.3 And the graviton?

The existing TOE hypothesis identifies the graviton as a spin-2 computational excitation of a real gravitational field. In ordinary field-theoretic language, a real spin-2 field has no independent antigraviton species:

$$\boxed{\bar{G} = G.} \quad (27)$$

Within the TOE interpretation, this is exactly what one would expect if the graviton sector lies on a fixed-point branch of the microscopic inversion:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\text{TOE}}(G) = G. \quad (28)$$

Its five-state qdit structure, if retained, must therefore be compatible with self-conjugacy at the level of the full representation and reduce to the observed two-helicity gravitational field in four dimensions.

That is elegant. It is also a calculation waiting to happen.

9 What antimatter forces the TOE to respect

The addition of antiparticles is not cosmetic. It throws constraints backward onto the entire theory.

1. **Positive-energy quantum theory.** The observable 4D limit cannot depend on literal negative-energy matter sectors.
2. **Conjugate representations.** Gauge charges and internal quantum numbers must emerge in particle-antiparticle conjugate pairs with the correct Standard Model representations.
3. **CPT consistency.** The completed local Lorentz-invariant quantum limit must reproduce the experimentally supported CPT structure, or explicitly identify which theorem hypothesis is abandoned.
4. **Controlled symmetry breaking.** The TOE must permit the observed violation of C , P , and CP in the weak sector rather than accidentally predicting exact matter-antimatter symmetry.
5. **Gravity.** Antimatter must fall gravitationally as observed, within experimental bounds, unless the theory produces a new effect that survives current constraints.
6. **Cosmology.** The theory must provide a mechanism capable, at least in principle, of generating the observed matter-antimatter asymmetry without destroying its successful low-energy quantum limits.
7. **No double ontology.** The theory should not need “matter stuff” plus “antimatter stuff.” If the field/state architecture already contains conjugate excitations, the second inventory is redundant.

Reality veto / falsification requirement

The strongest version of the TOE prediction is not “the TOE explains antimatter.” It is more demanding: *the TOE makes antiparticle structure unavoidable while simultaneously recovering every tested low-energy property of matter-antimatter conjugation.*

10 The research target

A completed theory should replace the conceptual arrows by derivations. A minimal target set is:

$$\text{microscopic action} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\text{micro}}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{micro}}^2 = 1, \quad (30)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{micro}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{4D}, \quad (31)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{4D} : Q \rightarrow -Q, \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{4D} : m \rightarrow m, \quad (33)$$

$$\mathcal{C}_{4D} : \text{representation} \rightarrow \text{conjugate representation}, \quad (34)$$

$$\text{microscopic theory} \rightarrow \text{CPT-consistent 4D QFT}, \quad (35)$$

$$\text{cosmological dynamics} \rightarrow n_B - n_{\bar{B}} > 0, \quad (36)$$

$$\text{gravitational sector} \rightarrow a_{\bar{H}} \approx a_H \approx g. \quad (37)$$

The most interesting equation is the bridge:

$$\boxed{\mathcal{I}_{\text{Omega}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\text{micro}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{4D}} \quad (38)$$

If that bridge cannot be derived, then the antiparticle interpretation remains a beautiful analogy. If it can, the architecture has connected an apparently ordinary Standard Model feature to its deepest proposed ontology.

11 No sacred variables

Not matter. Not antimatter. Not charge. Not the TOE. Not OIP. Not inversion.

Antiparticles earn their place because experiments require them and quantum field theory predicts them with extraordinary precision. The TOE earns its place only if it explains that structure without breaking the physics already known.

Assume boldly. Differentiate. Relate. Measure. Then let reality decide.

 (39)

Epilogue: The mirror

Perhaps the deepest lesson of antimatter is that nature does not need two universes to produce two faces of a quantum state.

One field can carry both. One algebra can contain both. One transition structure can connect both.

The electron and positron are not strangers separated by a metaphysical wall. They are conjugate excitations of the same relativistic quantum architecture. Their charges oppose. Their masses match. Their spin magnitudes match. They can be created together. They can annihilate together. And when they do, the state does not vanish from the universe; it changes form.

That makes antiparticles an unusually clean candidate for the All Is Epistemic viewpoint.

Reality is not required to store a separate substance called “anti.” It only has to permit a transformation that maps one distinguishable state into its conjugate.

And now the dangerous question appears.

What if the familiar particle-antiparticle inversion is not the deepest inversion in nature, but only the low-energy shadow of a larger one?

That is where OIP enters.

Not as a slogan. Not as permission. Not as a sacred symmetry.

As a derivation target.

$\Omega \rightarrow \text{microscopic inversion} \rightarrow \text{particle} / \text{antiparticle} \rightarrow \text{observed reality.}$

 (40)

If the mathematics says yes, continue. If it says no, bow, update, and measure again.

The mirror gets the last word.

All is epistemic. The rest must be earned.

A Compact reference equations

$$(i\gamma^\mu \partial_\mu - m)\psi = 0, \quad (41)$$

$$\psi(x) \sim a u e^{-ipx} + b^\dagger v e^{+ipx}, \quad (42)$$

$$\mathcal{C}^2 = 1, \quad (43)$$

$$\mathcal{C} : |\Sigma, Q, \lambda\rangle \mapsto |\bar{\Sigma}, -Q, \bar{\lambda}\rangle, \quad (44)$$

$$m_{\bar{a}} = m_a, \quad (45)$$

$$Q(s) + Q(\mathcal{C}s) = 0, \quad (46)$$

$$\bar{G} = G \quad (\text{for a self-conjugate real graviton field}), \quad (47)$$

$$\Omega = \text{paired states} \cup \text{fixed points}. \quad (48)$$

B Selected references and anchors

References

- [1] P. A. M. Dirac, “The Quantum Theory of the Electron,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* 117, 610-624 (1928).
- [2] C. D. Anderson, “The Positive Electron,” *Physical Review* 43, 491-494 (1933).
- [3] CERN, “Antimatter,” CERN Physics overview, accessed October 2026.
- [4] S. Navas et al. (Particle Data Group), *Review of Particle Physics 2024*, especially “Tests of Conservation Laws.”
- [5] U.S. Department of Energy, “Making Matter from Collisions of Light,” 2022, describing evidence for the Breit-Wheeler process in relativistic heavy-ion collisions.
- [6] CERN, “Antimatter atoms produced and trapped at CERN,” ALPHA overview.
- [7] CERN/ALICE, “The ALICE experiment at CERN makes precise comparison of light nuclei and antinuclei.”
- [8] CERN BASE Collaboration, “BASE breaks new ground in matter-antimatter comparisons,” 2022; proton-antiproton charge-to-mass ratio agreement at the 16 parts-per-trillion level.
- [9] ALPHA Collaboration / CERN, “ALPHA experiment at CERN observes the influence of gravity on antimatter,” 2023.
- [10] CERN, “Largest matter-antimatter asymmetry observed,” 2022.
- [11] CERN CMS Collaboration, “CMS explores subtle matter-antimatter difference using beauty mesons,” 17 July 2026.
- [12] H. Acharya et al. (LEGEND Collaboration), “First Results on the Search for Lepton Number Violating Neutrinoless Double- β Decay with the LEGEND-200 Experiment,” *Physical Review Letters* 136, 022701 (2026).