Inertia and Spin: My Opinion

Israel Sadovnik, 2009

1. Aristotle.
Every object needs force/power/energy for its moving. If no force, no moving.

2. Newton.
Of course great Aristotle is right saying that there is no movement without forces. I respect him very much and I won't make a fool myself quarrelling with him. However I can say more and explain Aristotle's opinion by the formula F = ma. It means, the force of moving Object depends on acceleration which it gives to this object's mass. But here I have two opportunities / possibilities.

a) The acceleration appears as a result of outside influence. One body (moving body) interacts with another body (moving or resting).
b) But if I have only one, single body moving in the straight line and it doesn't interact with another body it means that this body also must have an acceleration. In this situation I don't know how the acceleration appears, I don't know if it is inner acceleration of body, I know nothing about this acceleration. But this kind of acceleration must exist and I will name it "inertia".

3. Mach.
Newton doesn't know the reason of inertia, but maybe inertia depends on all stars, on all the matter in the Universe.

4. Planck.
Newton's inertia is very strange, and Mach's idea too. But if I will take that our Universe looks like a "black body " then I can suggest that must be some very small particle (quant) which can move "inertial" with constant speed c = 1 over a period of time. I will write this "inertial" moving of quanta by formula: h = Et. But really, it is hard for me to believe that I am right.

5. Einstein.
Of course Planck is right. But I don't like the way he reached the result. He says nothing concrete about the particle and the reason of this acceleration's beginning. I will take another road. If I use the Boltzmann resting particle (R/N = k) and give him Wien's displacement constant (b), as an acceleration, then the particle will have the Planck's impulse but now the formula is h = kb. Planck's formulas and my own are equal, as they explain behavior of quant (light quanta) from different point of view.

6. Goudsmit – Uhlenbeck.
It is all well. But we can see different kinds of movings in the real Nature And look at Planck's formula h = Et. It includes time (t). And time, by its nature, is a limited parameter. It means that this particle cannot go straight at all time with constant speed c = 1. This kind of moving must be temporary and can change. So, another possibility is that the particle can spin around itself and we will write this kind of moving by formula $\hbar = h/2\pi$.

7. L. de Broglie and Heisenberg.
These two spins of particle are very important parameters, so we will try to explain all phenomena in the Nature using only these parameters.

But, unfortunately, neither had success. Why did they fail? Because spin parameters are not enough. The spin parameters belong to the particle who/ which have/has also another parameters: speed (c) and volume (a) and all together they can create particle which we call electron: $e^2 = \alpha hc$. Now using electron and Boltzmann particle (R/N = k) it is possible to explain the beginning of star formation (gravitation) and later all another phenomena of Nature.