

Re: Query about Range of validity of field equations in Quantum Field Theory

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-11/msg02616.html>

- *From:* xxein <xxein1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 24 Nov 2008 19:36:18 -0800 (PST)
-

On Nov 22, 5:50 am, Hayek <haye...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

xxeinwrote:

We have quantumly invented all kinds of things. Most of which we can measure. The graviton is not going to be one of them. Gravity has a different character. It is the ability of the rest of the quantum particles to self-simulate into a form;

The way I see itxxein, that there is only one thing that is quantized, and that is the unit of work.

Nature does this by making inertia fail, at uncertainty conditions. Nature does not allow to store energy in the form of inertia, at any energy level lower than this. It is not the electric, magnetic, or electromagnetic phenomena that are quantized, it is inertia, a component of the gravitational field that fails at small scales. Thus in fact, quantization has only one cause, the failure of inertia/gravitation.

Now, how can we quantize gravitation ?

That is the problems with physics nowadays, all calculation, and certainly not knowing what they are doing.

This leads me to say :

"Quantum Gravity is an oxymoron"

Uwe Hayek.

xxein: Forgive me for not responding sooner. Reading, thinking, contemplation and absorbing a thought may look different on a day by day basis. This comes from being unsure of what the physic really is. We fluctuate, by forgetting some things only to remember others.

Re: Query about Range of validity of field equations in Quantum Field Theory

This makes a belief transient. Is it short or long term? Only a look at history can answer that. We do poorly as the track record shows.

But you are speaking in riddles. If inertia fails at small scales, would you like to say that gravity doesn't? I don't get your point.

I'll give you my opinion regarding this, though. Inertia can exist with matter and energy. Matter and energy cannot completely fill a void. They have the potential, not mere properties or a web, that allows them to move and interact. It is the 'move part' that is continuous. It is the interaction that is wanted to be quantized.

We know that something goes from here to there. We fail to see that our measurement of it all requires that we measure it with something. That is where the quantization steps in. It is not in a movement such a gravity or expansion provides; it becomes the granular scale because of what we can measure it with.

OK. Why can't we measure a continuity at small scale, you might ask. Think about it. Every one of the smallest structures of matter was formed by an incongruity of the energy it interacted with. They were formed as a coalescent energy that differed from the free energy. Yadda, yadda, yadda.

We might not know exactly how or why how this happens, but we do know that is how this works (to the very best of our knowledge).

What this means is that matter, itself, exists in a quantum state. Only a less infinite and imperfect form of energy can form to be matter. We are it.

It is quantum to our measurement because our tools to measure are already quantumized. They exist as lumps of energy in it's own system of existing as what we call matter.

We know matter changes in "quantum leaps". There is nothing wrong with that behavior. It is how we measure it. We are the continuously quantum leap that measures it.

We know of adiabatic behavior (and I'll throw in chaos that somehow leads to self-similarity).

You have a lot more thinking to do outside the normal channels that any existing physical theory can provide. Step into the water. It is not as cold as you may think it is.

Right now, you have solidified yourself into a winter and are walking on thin ice. Yeah, the water is cold. Come summer, you might wish to take a swim. But there is no season for thoughts. I can only hope that you can understand the physic from without a preformed belief.

Re: Query about Range of validity of field equations in Quantum Field Theory

I wish you well.