

Re: No new Einstein

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.research/2005-07/msg00189.html>

- *From:* cmaj10@xxxxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Mon, 18 Jul 2005 06:00:36 +0000 (UTC)
-

Ed Hanna wrote:

> markwh04@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:

>> LEJ Brouwer wrote:

>>> More specifically Einstein believed:

>>> (c) That there exists a classical field theory unifying gravity,

>>> electrodynamics and quantum theory.

>>>

>>> Anyone who poo-poops any of the above beliefs/visions of Einstein is

>>> simply not of Einstein's calibre, and can neither hope to be, nor is

>>> worthy of being, the next Einstein.

>>

>> "One can give good reasons why reality cannot at all be represented by

>> a continuous field. From the quantum phenomenon it appears to follow

>> with certainty that a finite system of finite energy can be completely

>> described in terms of a finite set of numbers (quantum numbers). This

>> does not seem to be in accordance with a continuum theory, and must

>> lead to an attempt to find a purely algebraic theory for the

>> description of reality. But nobody knows how to find the basis for

>> such a theory"

>>

>> -- Albert Einstein, *The Meaning of Relativity*, 1956 (posthumous)

>

> And let's not forget:

>

> In 1936 Einstein wrote that: "To be sure, it has been pointed out that

> the introduction of a space-time continuum may be considered as

> contrary to nature in view of the molecular structure of everything

> which happens on a small scale. It is maintained that perhaps the

> success of the Heisenberg method points to a purely algebraical method

> of description of nature, that is, to the elimination of continuous

> functions from physics. Then, however, we must also give up, on

> principal, the space-time continuum. It is conceivable that human

> ingenuity will some day find methods which will make it possible to

> proceed along such a path." (p. 319.)

>

> In 1940 Einstein wrote that: "All attempts to represent the particle

> and wave features displayed in the phenomena of light and matter, by

> direct recourse to a space-time model, have so far ended in failure.

> .. For the time being, we have to admit that we do not possess any

Re: No new Einstein

- > general theoretical basis for physics, which can be regarded as its
- > logical foundation. ... Some physicists, among them myself, cannot
- > believe that we must abandon, actually and forever, the idea of direct
- > representation of physical reality in space and time; or that we must
- > accept the view that events in nature are analogous to a game of
- > chance." (p. 334.)
- >
- > Both quotes from collected writings found in: A. Einstein. Ideas and
- > Opinions. (Crown, New York, 1954).
- >
- > Regards,
- > Ed Hanna

And let's underline:

"... Some physicists, among them MYSELF, CANNOT BELIEVE that we must abandon, actually and forever, the idea of direct representation of physical reality in space and time; or that we must accept the view that events in nature are analogous to a game of chance."

In less diplomatic terms he could have written: "There are good reasons to waste time of this red herring, but my superior intuition and philosophical principles prevent me from doing so."

Chris

• **References:**

- ◆ **No new Einstein**
 - ◇ From: John Baez
 - ◆ **Re: No new Einstein**
 - ◇ From: LEJ Brouwer
 - ◆ **Re: No new Einstein**
 - ◇ From: markwh04
 - ◆ **Re: No new Einstein**
 - ◇ From: Ed Hanna
-
- Prev by Date: **Re: Time, Parameter, Operator**
 - Next by Date: **nuclear binding energy for deuteron**
 - Previous by thread: **Re: No new Einstein**
 - Next by thread: **Re: No new Einstein**
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ **Date**
 - ◆ **Thread**