

How Physics Became a Blind Science

Mohamed Ashraf Farouk*

Department of Physics, Ain Shams University, Egypt

***Corresponding author:** Mohamed Ashraf Farouk, Department of Physics, Ain Shams University, Egypt, Email: ashraflight@windowslive.com

Submission: 📅 December 16, 2017; **Published:** 📅 January 09, 2018

Abstract

In my previous paper I showed that the central concept or the ground on which the eminent physicists “Einstein, schrodinger, de Broglie, Maxborn, Heisenberg, Dirac, David pohm, Bohr (and Copenhagen school ... etc.” stand above is false ground. I showed that light hasn't a dual (wave-particle) nature. In the present essay I'll shows that; despite Copenhagen Interpretation of quantum mechanics leads to predictions which are in excellent agreement with experiment. However, it leads to fictious (Pseudo) view for the nature of both light and later matter. It caused the physics (step by step) to become finally a blind science”.

Introduction

Copenhagen quantum model

Experts quantum theorists reconcile the particle and the wave model in a single picture (the quantum model) they said; light emerging from the point source in the form of corpuscles (“quanta”) in all directions each quantum (photon) contains energy ($h\nu$), these quanta are localized in space, moving without being divided and which can be emitted or absorbed only as a whole, their speed “ C ” these quanta are associated with a. probability wave. Such that the intensity of the wave indicate the number of corpuscles is a volume element at time ‘ t ’ : The intensity of the wave decreasing as the square of the distance from the point source, i.e. the number of corpuscles decreases as the square of the distance from the source (Figure 1).




Figure 1: The quantum model.

The quantum model is a fictious model for the following reasons:

- a. The pseudo picture does not figurize, it does not illustrate, it does not picturize, it does not explain “How the energy of such proposed corpuscles (photon) depend on the frequency of their associated probability wave (whose state it represents). It should be noted that it is not sufficient to say it is the nature).
- b. There is no definite scientific meaning for what is physically meant by the non-stop use of the mysterious word (associated) by most physicists.
- c. The pseudo quantum pictures does not shows, the nature of physical connection between the source and the separated proposed corpuscles (which fly out through space) such that, the intensity of the emerging probability wave indicate the number of photons in a volume element dv at a time t (Maxborn view).
- d. The picture does not explain how these separated photons distribute themselves by such a way; it does not tell us are they independent on each other or there is some kind of physical link between them?

The result of the physicists thinking is the following:

- a. They attribute to light falsely a (wave-particle) dual nature, then they are generalized this idea to include everything in the universe (all carriers of energy and momentum propagate as waves and exchange energy like particles).
- b. They attribute to the science of physics (the science of great exactude) falsely a probabilistic statistical nature.
- c. They create the uncertainty principle with its phlosphical

consequences, and finally they reached to the random chances [1-5].

How Physics Became a Blind Science

Einstein in 1905 proposed that light consists of corpuscles called photons each with energy= $h\nu$. He receive Nobel Prize for this assumption. Let us see the consequences of the photon assumption.

First I say from this moment, we started the absence of imagination

Modern physicists said

a. Dirac; no satisfying picture for the photon process has been given, the main object of physical science is not provision of pictures but formulation of laws.

b. I.V. Savelyv; Therefore the best way we can do is to discard all attempts to construct a visual model of the quantum object or the quantum process and the absence of visualization may first give rise to feeling of dissatisfaction but this feeling passes with time.

c. Michael A Morison; Even if you can't visualize what goes in the microworld of atoms you can grasp the physical law that govern the world. Lowdien; we try to make the absence of a picture as something possible.

d. Hiesenberg; the ultimate origin of the difficulty lies in the fact that, we are compelled to use the words of common.

language when we wish to describe a phenomenon, not by logical or mathematical analysis, but by picture appealing to the imagination.

Second now days, the modern physicists said;

1. Science does not furnish any really ultimate or satisfying explanation.

2. It is impossible to explain phenomena and it is in fact senseless to try.

3. No explanation concerning the nature of things can be demanded or expected.

4. The scientist has no business to ask; what is the real nature of physical phenomenon.

5. The modern quantum scientist has only two main objectives;

a. Control

b. Predict

6. The physicists believe that for logical philosophical considerations (Hume and Kant), the theory in the modern physical science is not an explanation in any normal sense of the word, such classical explanation by analogy is a complete fraud [6,7].

Third the absence of imagination and explanation forced the physicists to change the nature of physics as the following:

1. Bohr; It is wrong to think that the task of physics is to find

out how nature behaves, physics concerns with what we can say about nature.

2. Lowdien; The interpretation is not an essential part in physics.

3. Dirac; Only questions about the results of the experiment has a real significance, any other questions should be regarded as outside the domain of science.

4. Bohr; It is the nature itself and not out nature which forces us into this new and in many ways, uncomfortable way of thinking.

5. The bizarre nature of the quantum world must be accepted. Scientific American "The reality of the quantum world".

6. Prof. Wheeler, no quantum phenomenon is a phenomenon until it is registered. Physics is the observation-No scientific meaning for any question about what happen between any two observations.

7. Heisenberg; measuring the position of the electron create an electron has position-observations create reality (Yes of course, the cat is remains has not a definite state or a specific condition, it is sustained in between life and death till we open the box and observe it).

8. The physical universe consists of a large number of bodies of which the observers as an essential part, the features of the physical world (universe) is in separable from the inhabitants that observe it.

9. Physics becomes defined as the laws, principles and rules (all mathematical in form) which determine the results of the experiments.

Physicists transfer physics to become science of "too complex mathematics I'm in complete agreement with Einestim whom called the quantum mechanics equations as "Real black magic calculus"*. Even for him the new mechanics appeared to being all too complex [8-13].

My Comment is the Following

Classical scientific man confronts any phenomena what does he wish to do?

There are three objects:

a. He has a deep craving to "understand", i.e. he wish to know the real nature of the physical phenomenon. That is in the first place.

b. He wishes to control the phenomenon.

c. He can predict the phenomenon.

What do we mean by the word "understand"?

a. He form a visual picture of the system or the phenomenon under investigation via using models.

b. He appreciate the role of the idealized model "approximate representation of physical situations that are simplified to facilitate

analysis and calculations.

c. He needs a developing a theoretical (laws) framework within which scientist can describe events and data. I.e. he needs a scientific explanation.

Such theoretical framework must also gives or introduce an interpretation of what the events are an indication of the reason they occur, the way they do, via relating them to such unified framework.

Now, I would like to say that Developing and elaborating the right explanation was a major part of the scientific enterprise, i.e. Scientific explanation was the core of the game of science.

Finally a suitable theory should be developed, the purpose of a theory is to describe and explain observable and observed events and to predict what will be observed under certain specified condition.

Theories are the levels at which scientists consciously explain the phenomena of their domain.

Finally, I would like to say

The theory in the modern physical science is like a “black box”, it consists of a body of mathematical equations-these equations state the interdependence of a few several quantities represented by letters in the equations. The equations or more generally, the theory, are a sort of “Black box” you can feed one set of numbers into this black box turn the crank, and outcomes a set of numbers. If this second set correlates properly with numbers which can be determined, following given rules from nature. Then you have a successful theory. You must accept the result, be thankful and ask no further questions”.

Now, I wonder what we can do if we found that the number derived from experiment or nature does not coincide with the numbers which were previously solved out of the equations of such “black box”, in such case, no way for modifications. By other words the unexpected event which should be our chance to advance. Now instead of that we lost that chance. So, we are unable to make any modifications, because we have no scientific basis that enable us to replace such “black box” with new one, Because we are not essentially understand what is happening in the first place in order to adjust it that is because physicists made the absence of imagination and explanation as LEGAL matter.

Conclusion

The photon assumptions leads to the absence of imagination leads to the absence of explanation leads to changing the nature of physics, to become a blind science.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express the deepest appreciation to Professor El Syed Yehia El zyat, for fruitful discussion and scientific comments. In addition, a thank you to professor Salah Arfa, who encourage me to complete this dissertation.

References

1. 5GNOW (2013) D3.1: 5G waveform candidate selection. Tech Rep.
2. Rohde, Schwarz (2016) Application Note “5G waveform candidates”.
3. Schaich F, Wild T (2014) Waveform contenders for 5G-OFDM vs. FBMC vs. UFMC. ISCCSP pp. 457-460.
4. Farhang-Boroujeny B (2011) OFDM versus filter bank multicarrier. IEEE Signal Process Mag 28(3): 92-112.
5. Vakilian V, Wild T, Schaich F, Ten Brink S, Frigon JF (2013) Universal-filtered multi-carrier technique for wireless systems beyond LTE. IEEE Globecom Workshops pp. 223-228.
6. Wunder G, Jung P, Kasparick M, Wild T, Schaich F, et al. (2014) 5GNOW: non-orthogonal, asynchronous waveforms for future mobile applications. IEEE Commun Mag 52(2): 97-105.
7. Arun G, Manushree B (2012) An overview: Peak to average power ratio in OFDM system & its effect. International Journal of Communication and Computer Technologies 1(2).
8. Pooja M, Silki B, Himanshu M (2016) PAPR reduction methods for multicarrier modulation schemes used in next generation wireless networks-A review. International Journal of Broadband Cellular Communication 2(2): 35-44.
9. Chen Y, Schaich F, Wild T (2014) Multiple access and waveforms for 5G: IDMA and universal filtered multi-carrier. IEEE 79th VTC Spring, pp. 1-5.
10. Wild T, Schaich F, Chen Y (2014) 5G Air interface design based on universal filtered (UF-) OFDM. 19th International Conference on Digital Signal Processing, pp. 699-704.
11. An C, Kim B, Ryu HG (2016) Waveform comparison and nonlinearity sensitivities of FBMC, UFMC and W-OFDM systems. 8th International Conference on Networks & Communications, pp. 83- 90.
12. Pooja R, Silki B, Himanshu M (2017) Effect of transmission parameters on PAPR of universal filter multicarrier modulation systems.
13. Pooja R, Silki B, Himanshu M (2017) Performance evaluation of multi-carrier modulation techniques for next generation wireless systems. International Journal of Advances in Computer Science 8(5): 508-511.