

A letter concerning the physics of gravity

5 *My attempt to address all guests of the AEI
in one single mail did not work
and it turned out, that I was not all permitted
to address any one of them..*

10 **From:** Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2019 4:22 PM
To: Kirill Bazarov
Subject: Physics of gravity

15 Dear Guest at the Albert-Einstein-Institut,
Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitations-Physik,

attached please find my letter to Gerardus 't Hooft asking for his rigorous
criticism of my recent paper on the physics of gravity, which I have
20 published in the 'News flash' on my website and which I attach for ready
reference.

Maybe you find the time to read 'in' or 'through' my paper and to find the
flaws, if any, - and/or to draw your conclusions. Any substantial scrutiny
and/or elaboration of my model of the physics of gravity, you or any of your
25 colleagues may care to contribute, will be published on my website.

With kind regards yours,
Michael Schmiechen.

30 m.schm@t-online.de
www.m-schmiechen.de

35 **From:** Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Sunday, January 13, 2019 5:08 PM
To: Gerardus 't Hooft
Cc: Spektrum Leserbriefe
40 **Subject:** Fw: Das Universum als zellulärer Automat: Spektrum (2018) 12,
20-23

Dear Gerardus 't Hooft,

since I have not received any response from Spektrum, nor from you, I dare to contact you myself and to repeat my modest request for a critical review of my paper on the physics of gravity.

5 A matter of fact I have further streamlined my arguments in the revised file attached and am looking forward to the more or hopefully less fundamental flaws you may have detected.

10 With my best wishes for the new year
yours, Michael Schmiechen.

15 **From:** Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Monday, December 3, 2018 5:32 PM
To: Spektrum Leserbriefe
Subject: Fw: Das Universum als zellulärer Automat: Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23

20 Sehr geehrtes Team,

in aller gebotenen Bescheidenheit gehe ich davon aus, dass Sie meine mail an Herrn Prof. 't Hooft weitergeleitet haben. Oder soll ich das selber machen?

25 Mit freundlichen Grüßen zur Advents-Zeit
Ihr Michael Schmiechen.

30 **From:** Michael Schmiechen
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2018 5:10 PM
To: Spektrum Leserbriefe
Subject: Das Universum als zellulärer Automat: Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23

35 Dear Gerardus 't Hooft,

with great expectations I have read the interview you gave Spektrum (2018) 12, 20-23. *But ...*

40 On page 22 you (or Manon Bischoff?) raise the impression, that David Bohm 'needed' nearly (?) infinitely many universes. According to my knowledge this is *not* in accordance with Bohm's conception of the universe, which is in accordance with Newton's gravity law. Any body of
45 ponderable matter is part of the source field of the mass potential, constituting the universe, the physical space we happen to live in, carrying

our weights due to being prevented from falling freely, at least most of the time here on Earth.

5 And according to my knowledge of Bohm's theory quantum objects are described as clouds of ideal continua in n-dimensional state spaces, *not* universes! Schrödinger's classical (!) 'wave' equation, derived in my opus magnum (2009/897 ff), describes 'only' the dynamics of the 'moving' cloud. Bohm has 'added' the missing kinematic state equation, *not* 'hidden parameters'. Concerning this subject I quote only a remark by John S. Bell
10 from my opus magnum (2009/906 f).

"This theory is equivalent experimentally to ordinary nonrelativistic quantum mechanics - and it is rational, it is clear, and it is exact and it agrees with experiment, and I think it is a scandal that students are not told about it.
15 Why they are not told about it? I have to guess here there are mainly historical reasons, but one of the reasons is surely, that this theory takes almost all the *romance* out of quantum mechanics. This scheme is a living counterexample to most of the things that we tell the public on the great lessons of twentieth century science."
20

While I write this, it occurs to me, that my exposition concerning the kinematic state equation may need to be up-dated! But these observations are *not* the reason for my mail, which has in fact been triggered by your (or Manon Bischoff's?) very short remarks concerning 'gravitation' on page 23.
25 True is, that physicists still do *not* understand, how 'gravity' works. And I claim, that this fact is due to their fashionable ignorance of the implications of classical dynamics and of Newton's law of gravity.

30 My rather simple approach follows the safe route, recommended by philosophers. To protect me from talking nonsense, I do *not* talk about 'gravitation', *but* modestly and cautiously only about 'gravity' (Schwere). I followed this line of thinking during my reconstruction of classical dynamics, now more than ten years ago, although the purpose of my opus magnum, now freely available on my website, was *not* to 're-search' gravity.
35

Since that time I have published explanatory expositions of my conception of gravity for nearly any 'taste'. And very recently I have published a conclusive, axiomatic exposition concerning this subject, addressed to experts. 'Encouraged' by your remarks I modestly dare to draw your
40 attention to that brochure, attached for ready reference, and politely ask your favour to take the time and rigorously scrutinise my conception and my arguments.

45 In view of the fact, that physicists are *not only* 'Lost in Math', *but also* 'Lost in [incoherent] Jargon', as Sabine Hossenfelder and the scientists she interviewed, I dare to doubt, that young persons indoctrinated that way, will solve the problems physicists are still facing. Adhering to conceptions,

which have caused the problems to be solved, results in irresponsible waste of research resources.

5 With kind regards and best wishes for enjoyable reading I am looking forward to your response.
Yours, Michael Schmiechen.

10 PS1. In accordance with my practice I shall publish this letter together with your response on my website, which as a publication proper is regularly collected and permanently archived by Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

PS2. Details concerning my person and my work are to be found on my website, the most recent work in the 'News flash'.

15 m.schm@t-online.de
www.m-schmiechen.de