

Roger Penrose says, I comment in red

Quantum mechanics doesn't make sense when you're talking about macroscopic objects. O.K. I mean it's a theory of small things, particles, and so on. Yes, QM is a theory for the interactions of "small particles." For example, here's a sample: (0)(0) And people kind of say, well, big things are made up of small things, so the theory of small things must be more fundamental than the theory of big things. The best theory of big things we have is general relativity, O.K. which deals with black holes, stars, and galaxies, and how the universe as a whole behaves, and things like that. O.K. But OTR cheats in the sense of "assigning dimensions to the gravitational constant," making it a linear equation with dimensional balance. Roger Penrose wants to gravitate QM (change the linearity of quantum mechanics to nonlinearity, I don't know how), and I, on the other hand, want to gravitate OTR (change the linearity of OTR ($1 = G.M/c^2.x$) to nonlinearity by removing dimensions from the gravitational constant). And because people think that small things are in some sense more fundamental than big things, there is a big project called quantizing gravity. Quantizing gravity is like taking a geometric parabola and cutting it into infinitesimal segments and then putting those segments back together, you get the line (that you want). That's the scam...that I pointed out 20 years ago. Quantizing gravity is the same thing in pale pink. It's a scam. Linearizing a parabola is a scam. That means taking [the rules of] quantum mechanics and applying them to gravitational theory. No, that won't solve it. And since quantum theory is more fundamental, the argument goes, you have to do it. Now my opinion is almost the opposite.??

Quantum mechanics doesn't make sense when you're talking about macroscopic objects. O.K. I mean it's a theory of small things, particles, and so on. Yes, QM is a theory for the interaction of "small particles". For example, here's a sample: (0)(0) https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_010.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_046.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_067.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_082.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_099.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_210.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_287.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_288.jpg ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_438.jpg ;

<https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/index.php?nav=eb> ; And people say, well, big things are made up of little things, so the theory of little things must be more fundamental than the theory of big things. The best theory of big things we have is general relativity, O.K. which deals with black holes, stars and galaxies and how the universe as a whole behaves and things like that. O.K. But OTR cheats in the sense of "assigning dimensions to the gravitational constant," making it a linear equation with dimensional balance. Roger Penrose wants to gravitate QM (change the linearity of quantum mechanics to nonlinearity, I don't know how), and I, on the other hand, want to gravitate OTR (change the linearity of OTR ($1 = G.M/c^2.x$) to nonlinearity by removing dimensions from the gravitational constant) https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/eng/eng_211.pdf ; https://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/c/c_221.jpg ; the nonlinear "world" of large dimensions passes into a linear "world" in the microcosm...; Roger Penrose wants to gravitate QM (change the linearity of quantum mechanics to nonlinearity, I don't know how) and I, on the contrary, want to gravitate OTR (change the linearity of OTR ($1 = G.M/c^2.x$) to nonlinearity by removing dimensions from the gravitational constant). . And if people think that small things are somehow more fundamental than big things, there is a big project called quantizing gravity. Quantizing gravity is like taking a geometric parabola and cutting it into infinitely long lines and then putting those lines back together because you get a straight line (which you want). That is the scam...that I pointed out 20 years ago. Quantizing gravity is the same thing in pale

pink. It is a scam. Linearizing a parabola is a scam. That means taking the rules of quantum mechanics and applying them to gravitational theory. **No, that won't solve it.** And since quantum theory is more fundamental, the argument goes, you have to do it. Now my opinion is almost the opposite. **???**

JN,18.03.2025