

Why the Standard Model is a House of Cards

The two core assumptions of the Standard Model in physics are:

1. elementary particles are essentially random vectors
2. the forces between them are mediated by virtual bosons

1 is a little difficult to understand unless you have a background in statistics and probability. Fortunately, that was one of my undergraduate majors at Michigan State. Inherent indeterminacy is the more common expression describing elementary particles. Why propose such a concept? Because in the early days of quantum mechanics, there was this notion of Heisenberg uncertainty which equates with position-momentum exclusivity. Either you know one xor the other to high precision, but not both simultaneously. Multi-state atoms and molecules also play roles in this notion. Many atoms and molecules have equal energy states/configurations which we label "multi-state" because they appear to have distinct configurations simultaneously. To further confound matters, there is an additional associated concept called non-locality which appears when linked quantum systems, even light-years apart, exhibit like quantum states. All of these conclusions are based on assumption 1.

2 magnetism is most easily visualized by a localized cloud of virtual photons. The strong force, virtual gluons. The weak force, virtual W and Z. An extension of the Standard Model proposes for gravitation, virtual gravitons. All are easily visualizable and mathematically precise. Standard Model unification proposes at high energies, all four forces become united in a "super force" mediated by some super boson. These conclusions are based on assumption 2.

Why 1 appears true but does not have to be: elementary particles are **ALWAYS** moving: spinning, vibrating, and "orbiting". These correspond more precisely to spin, excitation, and orbital state. Absolute zero Kelvin is an unattainable theoretical limit that *no substance in the*

*universe can **EVER** achieve. **NOT A SINGLE PARTICLE IN THE UNIVERSE STANDS STILL.*** What does this mean for science? It takes **HUNDREDS OF YEARS** in science to determine a law of nature such as $F=ma$ or $E=mc^2$. The law of conservation of energy can be written $E_{in}=E_{out}$. Murphy's law is usually stated: "when something can go wrong, eventually it will". I restate it: "when we think we understand something, we probably don't". Many majors in university start by telling you certain "facts" about that field. When you graduate, you learn most of those "facts" are simplistic deceptions just to get you started, pedagogical tricks.

"Perhaps the most clear-cut example hearkens all the way back to 1926, when Johannes Fibiger won the Nobel Prize in Medicine for "for his discovery of the Spiroptera carcinoma." In layman's terms, he found a tiny parasitic worm that causes cancer. Subsequent research conducted in the decades following his receipt of the award would show that though the worm definitely existed, its cancer-causing abilities were entirely nonexistent."

https://www.realclearscience.com/blog/2015/10/nobel_prizes_awarded_for_disproved_discoveries.html

"The Nobel Prize in Physics 2013 was awarded jointly to François Englert and Peter W. Higgs "for the theoretical discovery of a mechanism that contributes to our understanding of the origin of mass of subatomic particles, and which recently was confirmed through the discovery of the predicted fundamental particle, by the ATLAS and CMS experiments at CERN's Large Hadron Collider""

https://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/2013/

Einstein **WASTED** his later life searching for unification between electromagnetism and gravitation. I vary between pity and admiration for him. Please enjoy the following clip:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e0tAeFfGwJ0>

Why that clip is funny to me is because ***I USED TO BE A TELEPHONE REPAIRMAN.***

Over the years, I've developed a concise consistent partial unification framework based on temporal elasticity. I've got it down to about one page of text. I'm fairly certain an older child could understand it. Why am I ignored?

1. I don't have a PhD in physics/anything
2. I'm not affiliated with any major university or research center
3. my ideas "buck convention" by requiring a major step backward in order to go two steps forward

sgm, 2018/JUN/10