Mr. Higgs Doesn't Reside There

Milos Abadzic
Otona Zupancica 32a, Beograd, Serbia 38111
e-mail: milabster@gmail.com

In addition to all the significant success achieved in the last one hundred years or more, there is the impression of a large number of physicists that physics as a science, has arrived at a certain saturation, or that it has come to some kind of blind alley. Instead of progress in science reducing the number of unsolved issues, we are faced within increase in this number. Trying to overcome the difficulties, we introduce a variety of paradoxes, dualism or magnitudes without any natural basis. [1] All this was not enough even for an illusory solution some newly found problems. Currently we expect from research in LHC (and as we hope ourselves), to find the Higgs particle, to which already are attributed a number of desired characteristics, which would enable us to resolve some of these issues. Wishes are nice but the question is whether or not they are realistic. I doubt the reality and think with part of our research we are pushing on the wrong side. No doubt we'll get some data for new particles from this research, but this will only be an increased of particles' debris created by decomposition. We may attribute to some of them, the desired properties and get magnitudes like the photon with currently unknown properties. I think that research requires some new approaches, not only for an increase in the energy resolution of our testing and measuring devices. This does not mean to belittle their importance but the question is whether the train leads to the desired goal - in this case, a deeper knowledge of Nature.

1. Introduction

I have no intention of engaging in a detailed analysis of the current situation in the natural sciences. I only want to give a global assessment, taking into account the aforementioned difficulties, because I believe that the observed difficulties are precisely in this global approach. It is not the technical aspect, but the conceptual that is in question.

Viewed from the global level I think it would be possible to evaluate the past period as *the period of the dictatorship of physicists, supported by mathematical formalism*. Namely, for an extended time we are attempting to solve fundamental problems, such as

- Physical (including chemistry, which is its integral part)
- Biological

only by physical methods, forgetting the fact that the nature is more complex and includes phenomena and processes that are still beyond the capabilities of our understanding, of nature, whether we know it or not, and accept it or not. Nature acts aside from our will in all its complexity, and disregards the views of our physicists and mathematicians. The question is whether to change our theories, or Nature. The logical answer is that the theory should adapt to Nature, although we have often done the opposite. We honor Einstein, but his thought that if the theory does not agree with the facts then we must change the facts, was a cover for many of our failures. It is time to make a change.

2. What to Do?

Bearing this in mind, the question is what to do in order to remove the present difficulties. Perhaps it is not so complicated and difficult. My proposal is a simple one. Our starting point so far, is based on the existence and activity of two substances:

- Material
- Electrical

which reflect the physical side of Nature. In fact I think that these two aspects should be viewed as two separate entities, which in some way combine, interact, and possess very different characteristics. Let's consider one magnitude that has its roots in biology and is observed widely. We must study the behavior of such combinations in realistic conditions and with respect to all appearance forms that we find in Nature. We may in fact find something new which we were not previously aware. I perceive it as a mental substance, but the name is not important. An important shift in how we expand our efforts in getting to know Nature and the complex laws to which it adheres, is required if we are to know something about it.

Such a shift requires more intensive and broader scientific activity, which should lead to a new view of Nature and the processes and phenomena within it, whose existence so far has not been made evident. It is difficult today to understand the potential achievements of such an approach. I have developed one model, called NMN and the possibilities are promising. I do not suggest that it is finally what we need, but I believe that is one step forward (in line with the old Chinese proverb, "the longest journey begins with the first step"). It is important to start the process. It would be useful in the beginning to create a consensus on the basic issues related to the essence of nature. (I hope as an example, an offset can be used. [2]). But it represents the hardest part of the job for the followed reasons:

- Setting up a new model whose final version must be the result of multiple iterations
- Analyzing the greater part of the available data but using a new approach
- Expected resistance by the scientific community towards such a change (opinion also has its own inertia)

I expect that this approach will be met with resistance. Some will resist with opinion, some because of vanity and some because of their status, social prestige and their dependence on current projects. However, I am indifferent to such concerns. In my professional life I say and do what I know and what I can. Today I am retired and free of constraints so that I can safely

express my views whether they are liked or not, particularly if I believe that these ideas are correct. After all, if I come up with some new idea, which I think has value, I feel it a duty to acquaint the scientific establishment with it in order for them to make their own judgments. I am available for discussion.

3. Conclusion

When we look at our efforts in recent years they are in good measure the searching for "magic" particles through which we will explain a number of still outstanding questions. We started with a photon, which has no electric charge and is the carrier of electromagnetic processes; it has no mass but has momentum and is still the carrier of electromagnetic force. We continued with strange bosons and now seek Higgs particle's using that to overcome a number of still outstanding questions. In essence we need substance, which will dispose of some sort of "memory" and, to order with the other two physical substances, would be have the ability to create a structure of which will possess some abilities of a self-organizing system. But this substance does not belong to the category of physical substances. Therefore, the above title of this work, "Mr. Higgs doesn't reside there". We must seek it elsewhere. I think that this is not the LHC.

Note: *I listed my book in reference [1], where I have tried to establish a model of Nature in accordance with the above approach. I think I have partially succeeded, but not enough. I am preparing a revised and edited edition in the hope that this new model will be more coherent.*

References

[1] M. Abadzic, "Concerning Nature - Part 1: Appearance and Process es," Serbian Text. Only, General Science Journal (May 21, 2007).

[2] M. Abadzic, "One Step Back, Two Steps Forward," 16th NPA Conference (2009).

[3] M. Abadzic, "Some Quantization Problems," 16th NPA Conference (2009).

[4] M. Abadzic, "Possibility of Cosmos Evolution," 16th NPA Conference (2009).