Fads and Fashions in Physics vs Conspiracies
sgm, 2018/NOV/25

Does anybody remember space-time foam? I do. How about jiggle-theory? I do.

Just as with news, manipulated media, and political/UFO conspiracies, it's silly to *continuously* blame some secret government / powerful families – for current trends in physics. Sure, there's *always* politics of physics going on regarding funding and media attention but .. just as with conspiracy theories, we waste too much time talking about them and giving them attention – when we need to look at the *succession of ideas* promoted and coddled by convention – in order to understand *in what direction* the 'movers and shakers' of physics are attempting to manipulate us plebians / common folk.

As mentioned above, it used to be space-time foam and perhaps jiggle-theory – it made sense – in their obfuscating framework. Then they realized that jiggle-theory was incompatible with quantum correlated systems – *and* – space-time foam detracted from vacuum energy so they ignored both concepts – not really outright declaring them invalid – hoping that over time, we'd forget about them.

I haven't.

Let's put together the sequence of core-ideas they've foisted on us plebians over the last 50 years:
1. space-time foam – that it's not just particles that are random in nature – space-time ***itself*** is randomly frothing chaotically at the quantum level; this concept has roots in Bohr's perspective that 'God' plays dice; 'God' is in quotes because it's a fictitious superstitious concept we plebians adhere to – NOT reality.
2. vacuum energy – that it's not just space-time frothing chaotically at the quantum level – random particles are popping in-and-out of existence – the shorter the time-frame, the more energetic the particles – and the following fact is conveniently ignored – at the shortest time-frame,

there should be spontaneously created *infinite-energy* pairs of particles O.O whoa!
3. the Higgs is an excitation in the Higgs field which imparts mass to vector-bosons which ultimately defines mass itself O.O wow! ***'Super Wonderful!!!'*** ;)

Look I'm not a theist because I'm weak and need to believe in 'something bigger than myself'; I *choose* to believe, plain and simple.

And physicists have taken certain core-assumptions of the Standard Model to the ultimate extreme, for me insane, limit of trying to define mass within their delusional framework.

Mom is always saying "balance" and Buddha also promoted / preached that concept .. Let's assume they're ***right*** about their singular core-assumption, elementary particles are inherently random, but ***wrong*** about implementation – and – that space-time itself is inherently random.

A ***reasonable balance*** between determinism and chaos is suggested above:
1. space-time is causal deterministic and continuous with two specific attributes – one for each – space and time individually – impedance and elasticity respectively {implications: NO foam / no quantum chaos / no vacuum energy}
2. elementary particles can accurately be characterized by quantum-vectors – essentially a list of quantifiable attributes – but probabilistic in nature, allowing for correlated systems and group phenomena

Ever since Bohr 'won', there has been a kind of mania in physics to make ***everything*** inherently random: space-time and cosmology – but it's over-kill and egoism on anti-determinists' parts to attempt to do so. It's simply unnecessary theoretically. The randomness in the proposed framework above is *necessary and sufficient* to explain the quasi-random phenomena observed in our universe.

Implications:
1. Casimir effects are *completely* misunderstood
2. the role of the Higgs is *completely* misunderstood
3. Bell's theorem does *not* apply to space-time

Let's start with 3 first:
Bell's theorem = 'no local realistic quantum theory can be valid'. In the first place, the framework above, the part about space-time, is *not* a quantum theory, so Bell's theorem literally does not apply.

2:
Higgs is associated with massive particles but this in itself – does ***not prove*** it *mediates mass*. It's kind of like me saying "feathers create lift because every bird-wing has them" while every aeronautical engineer knows it's the *shape of the wing* – that creates lift – *not feathers!*

1:
Plenty of examples in science where we *thought* we understood the causative agents of some phenomenon initially – only to find out it was *something else* later on: 'spontaneous generation' of life in a growth media, 'canals' on Mars, 'flag waving' on the Moon, 'crop circles',.. ;)

Even the framework above has its issues:
1. no proton decay ***ever*** observed
2. using neutrino transmutation to explain the neutrino-deficit problem is a 'bit' contrived
3. explaining no-observation *within their framework* of neutrinoless double-beta decay is also contrived

I know it's 'heresy' to suggest:
1. protons are Stable
2. ***maybe*** they misunderstand neutrino production processes?
3. beta decay is ***always*** characterized by:
   neutron → proton + electron + antineutrino
   where beta = electron
which implies that 2n → 2p + 2e + 2anti-v

and in order for those 2anti-vs to ‘disappear’, they’d need to be *absorbed* in *some* process that *requires* them. So discover a nuclear process theoretically that requires two antineutrinos and describe an experimental framework that should provide evidence for that process, you’ll win a Nobel prize .. maybe. ;)

I think it’s safe to say we live in a *mixed* universe where some phenomena are explainable deterministically and some probabilistically. Other than the explicit two exceptions, correlated systems and group phenomena, determinism works *perfect for **all*** macroscopic systems (and some microscopic systems – like the proton and double-beta decay). While the probabilistic framework is more appropriate for double-slit phenomena, complex quantum systems, and the like. This observational framework jives well with the proposed theoretical hybrid framework above.

You don’t have to be theistic to accept the framework above, just open minded. It would be kind of ‘nice’ for the universe to be *completely* one way or the other: probabilistic or deterministic – but – it’s unrealistic to *expect* it to be as such. If we *continuously* apply the wisdom of Occam in our search for understanding physical reality, we realize trying to force one paradigm or the other is unnatural and is essentially trying to force physical reality to *conform to our beliefs*.

In the history of the Catholic church, the Spanish Inquisition, the Crusades, the ‘witch’ burnings of Salem,.. I HATE our obsession with conformity and treatment of those who do not. Our shunning and neglect of viable alternative frameworks in theoretical physics is not much different. We as common folk should not let the aristocrats of physics *define* our perceptions nor understanding physical reality simply because of *their* belief systems. Nor should we trust them simply because ‘Dr.’ or PhD is associated with their names.

Buddha was an atheist and yet he promoted the middle-way. Maybe Bohr was right but we’ve taken his ideas too far with

the Higgs, Casimir, and over-applying Bell's theorem. That notion does not apply to temporal elasticity / curvature because that concept is part of a theory of space-time not quantum theory. Life is messy; almost nothing is 'nice and tidy'. One of the most fuel-efficient vehicles is a *hybrid*. That should be an indicator right there about the practicality of hybrid theoretical frameworks – messy and initially confusing – but eminently practical in the end.

Einstein believed we simply misunderstood the apparently random nature of elementary particles – and – wasted 40 years of his life trying to unify (to me the impossible) electromagnetism and gravitation. Had he known about the nuclear strong force and the concept of temporal elasticity, I'm confident he would have performed partial unification – gravistrong. But his faith in determinism and following a dead-lead, caused him to squander 40 years of his precious life.

If we let the conventional faith in chaos/randomness dominate in our schools/universities – and – dominate the funding of facilities and institutes – like CERN and the Perimeter Institute, eventually we'll squander centuries and countless lifetimes on a framework that in all likelihood – is incorrect.

Not everything is mediated by bosons.

Some things are clearly stable – like the proton.

Instead of trying to force physical reality to conform to our beliefs, why don't we take a hint and observe reality *rarely* conforms to *anything* – and try our best to devise a theoretical framework that *conforms to reality*.

Convention has done an amazing job of unifying 3 of 4 forces of nature; they need to 'let loose the reigns' a bit for unconventional theorists like me – with full positive media attention – and never forgetting Occam's razor – let us develop viable alternatives coming from Relativity. And funding wouldn't hurt neither. ;)