Short Communication Journal of Lasers, Optics & Photonics 2020

Vol.7 No.8

Applied Physics 2019: A different comment at the rules of classical physics, quantum physics and general relativity to discover the secret of creation - Jafar Oshriyeh - Independent Researcher

Jafar Oshriyeh

Independent Researcher, Iran

Articulation in this article, we study the standards of traditional material science, quantum material science and the hypothesis of general relativity from various points. We think about the principles of old style and quantum material science with the numerical standards that made them without help from anyone else. On the off chance that we take a gander at our general surroundings from the viewpoint of animals like PCs, astute programming and math fundamentals then we will comprehend if is there a maker on the planet. Also, what is the mystery of the production of the universe is the variety of the material science laws and the consistency and solidarity among them lastly how might we clarify the idea of god? This article looks straightforward yet changed and deciphers material science laws by means of new ways and contrasts the standards of arithmetic and exemplary and current material science and Einstein's overall relativity and gives them presence to make new contends. It would appear that this article takes a gander at the guidelines of the universe from another point that no one has ever taken a gander at it and attempts to locate an important connection between the different laws of material science on the planet. We present another meaning of time and in the end demonstrate that the world is planned a lot by god.

It is notable that quantum mechanics and (general) relativity don't fit well. I am contemplating whether it is conceivable to make a rundown of inconsistencies or issues between them? For example relativity hypothesis utilizes a space-time continuum, while quantum hypothesis utilizes discrete states.
I am not only searching for an answer or rejoinder of such contrary energies, more for a study of the field out of interest. There are zero logical inconsistencies between quantum mechanics and uncommon relativity; quantum field hypothesis is the system that brings together them.

General relativity additionally functions admirably as a low-energy powerful quantum field hypothesis. For questions like the low-energy dispersing of photons and gravitons, for example, the Standard Model coupled to general relativity is an entirely decent hypothesis. It possibly separates when you pose inquiries including invariants of request the Planck scale, when it neglects to be prescient; this is the issue of "non-renormalizability."

Non-renormalizability itself is not a problem; the Fermi hypothesis of frail cooperation's was non-renormalizable, however now we realize how to finish it into a quantum hypothesis including W and Z bosons that is predictable at higher energies. So non-renormalizability doesn't really highlight an inconsistency in the hypothesis; it just methods the hypothesis is deficient.

Gravity is more unobtrusive, however: the genuine issue isn't such a great amount of non-renormalizability as high-energy conduct conflicting with neighbourhood quantum field hypothesis. In quantum mechanics, on the off chance that you need to test material science at short separations, you can dissipate particles at high energies. (You can consider this being because of Heisenberg's vulnerability rule, in the event that you like, or pretty much properties of Fourier changes where making confined wave parcels requires the utilization of high frequencies.) By doing ever-higher-energy dispersing tests, you find out about material science at ever-more limited length scales. (This is the reason we assemble the LHC to consider material science at the altimeter length scale.) With gravity, this high-energy/short-separation correspondence separates. In the event that you could impact two particles with focus of-mass energy a lot bigger than the Planck scale, at that point when they impact their wave parcels would contain more than the Planck energy limited in a Planck-length-sized locale. This makes a dark opening. On the off chance that you disperse them at considerably higher energy, you would make a significantly greater dark opening, in light of the fact that the Schwarzschild span develops with mass. So the harder you attempt to consider more limited separations, the more terrible off you will be: you make dark openings that are greater and greater and gobble up ever-bigger separations. Regardless of what finishes general relativity to tackle the renormalizability issue, the material science of huge dark openings will be overwhelmed by the Einstein activity, so we can offer this expression even without knowing the full subtleties of quantum gravity. There are zero inconsistencies between quantum mechanics and exceptional relativity; quantum field hypothesis is the system that brings together them.

This work is partly presented at 6th International Conference on Theoretical and Applied Physics May on 16-17, 2019 held at Rome, Italy