

Does Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle Predict a Maximum Velocity for Anything with Rest-Mass below the Speed of Light ?

Espen Gaarder Haug*

January 20, 2018

Abstract

In this paper we derive a maximum velocity for anything with rest-mass from Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. The maximum velocity formula we get is in line with the maximum velocity formula suggested by Haug in a series of papers. This supports the assertion that Haug's maximum velocity formula is useful in considering the path forward in theoretical physics. In particular, it predicts that the Lorentz symmetry will break down at the Planck scale, and shows how and why this happens. Further, it shows that the maximum velocity for a Planck mass particle is zero. At first this may sound illogical, but it is a remarkable result that gives a new and important insight into this research domain. We also show that the common assumed speed limit of $v < c$ for anything with rest-mass is likely incompatible with the assumption of a minimum length equal to the Planck length. So one either has to eliminate the idea of the Planck length as something special, or one has to modify the speed limit of matter slightly to obtain the formula we get from Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.

Key words: Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, maximum velocity of matter, reduced Compton wavelength

1 Introduction

Haug [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] has recently suggested a new maximum velocity for subatomic particles (anything with mass) that is just below the speed of light. The formula is given by

$$v_{max} = c \sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\bar{\lambda}^2}} \quad (1)$$

where $\bar{\lambda}$ is the reduced Compton wavelength of the particle we are trying to accelerate and l_p is the Planck length [7, 8]. This formula can be derived from special relativity by simply assuming that the maximum frequency one can have is the Planck frequency $\frac{c}{l_p}$, or that the shortest wavelength possible is the Planck length. We will also get the same formula if we assume that the ultimate fundamental particle has a spatial dimension equal to l_p and always is traveling at the speed of light; this is a model outlined by [6, 1].

This maximum velocity for anything with rest-mass was first predicted by Haug in 2014. It was first derived from two postulates in atomism. The theory leads to the same mathematical end results as special relativity theory, as long as one use Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks. However, at that time Haug had not yet linked his theory up to key concepts of Max Planck. Here the key understanding given in 2014 will lead to the same formula described above.¹

In this paper we will show that the same formula implicitly agrees with a new result that comes out of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle when combined with a key insight from Max Planck.

2 Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle Leads to a Maximum Velocity for Anything with Rest-Mass

Heisenberg's uncertainty principle [9] is given by²

*e-mail espenhaug@mac.com. Thanks to Victoria Terces for helping me edit this manuscript and thanks to Jon Åge Ruud for useful comments.

¹Back then I only derived my maximum velocity formula with a link to one-sided relativistic Doppler shift, based on a slightly different clock synchronization procedure and therefore got slightly different results than those given here.

²See also Kennard [10], who was the first to "prove" this modern inequality based on the work of Heisenberg.

Further, we have the Taylor series expansion for

$$v_{max} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_e^2}} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_e^2} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{l_p^4}{\lambda_e^4} - \frac{1}{16} \frac{l_p^6}{\lambda_e^6} + \dots$$

In most cases, using only the first term of the Taylor series expansion will be more than accurate enough, and then we see that they are the same, which explains why we obtained the same numerical value for an electron.

This indicates that embedded in Heisenberg's uncertainty principle (when combined with key insight from Max Planck) we find an indication that Haug's maximum velocity formula for anything with rest-mass likely is correct and this supports the analysis provided in Haug's other papers on this topic.

Below we show some possible choices of assumptions, where only the theory presented above seems to be compatible with the Planck length being a minimum length. The idea of the velocity of a mass having to be below c , but coming as close to c as we want, is actually not compatible with accepting the Planck length as a minimum length.

1. $\sigma_x \leq l_p$ and $v \leq \frac{c}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{l_p^2}{\lambda_e^2}}}$. What we have derived above.
2. $\sigma_x > 0$ and $v < c$. This is the current theory on velocity, but it is incompatible with idea of Planck length as minimum. If modern physicists want to hold on to $v < c$, then they must reconsider and likely eliminate the Planck length. This is improbable and something I think would be very unwise; instead they should replace $v < c$ with the formula above.
3. $\sigma_x \geq 0$ and $v \leq c$. Impossible for anything with rest-mass, as the relativistic mass could become infinite, so this can easily be excluded.

Choice three can be excluded based on Einstein's analysis that a mass traveling at the speed of light will attain an infinitely large relativistic mass, so it is impossible to have the limit on v for anything with rest-mass. Choice two has the drawback that one must claim the Planck length is nothing special. Choice one is, in our view, an alternative that should be considered seriously by the physics community.

3 The Planck Mass Particle Must Stand Absolutely Still

The rest-mass of the Planck mass particle is given by

$$m_p = \frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} \approx 2.1765 \times 10^{-8} \text{ kg} \quad (7)$$

That is to say, the reduced Compton wavelength of a Planck mass particle is l_p . Further, we know that the Planck mass particle momentum is $m_p c$. Now let us combine this formula with Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, where we will set $\sigma_x = l_p$ again. In this special case, we think it makes sense to set it only "equal to" rather than "greater than or equal to," because, unlike any other particle, we claim that the Planck mass particle momentum must always be $m_p c$, and then there is no uncertainty per se in the momentum. However, the uncertainty principle limit must hold, and this is exactly what we see here

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_x \sigma_p &\geq \hbar \\ l_p \frac{m_p c}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} &= \hbar \\ l_p \frac{m c}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} &= \hbar \\ l_p \frac{\frac{\hbar}{l_p} \frac{1}{c} c}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} &= \hbar \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}} &= 1 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This can only happen when $v = 0$. That is to say, only a Planck mass particle must have a velocity of zero. This is the same result as given by Haug's maximum velocity formula for anything with rest-mass in the special case of a Planck mass particle,

$$v_{max} = c\sqrt{1 - \frac{l_p^2}{l_p^2}} = 0 \quad (9)$$

A velocity of zero (no matter reference frame from which it is observed) sounds absurd at first. But actually this is not so strange at all. The Planck mass particle, according to Haug, can only last for one Planck second. This is the collision point between two light particles. What is the speed of a light particle at the very turning point of light? It is zero. This means that light has two invariant “velocities”: when it is energy, it always moves at speed c as measured with Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks, no matter what reference frame may be. And the velocity is zero when the particle is colliding and stands still for one Planck second, also as measured with Einstein-Poincaré synchronized clocks. As we see, at the deepest level the world is likely binary: we only have the Planck mass particle lasting for one Planck second (colliding indivisible particles), and energy (non-colliding indivisible particles).

We predict that the Planck mass particle, the Planck length, and the Planck second are invariant and the same as observed from any reference frame. This means that Lorentz symmetry is broken at the Planck scale; this view is consistent with has been predicted by several scientists in relation to quantum gravity.

4 Conclusion

It looks like Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle predicts an exact maximum velocity for anything with rest-mass that is below the speed of light. For any practical purpose, this seems to be the same limit as given by Haug’s earlier suggested maximum velocity formula for anything with rest-mass.

This could have major implications how we look at light particles in the very collision point with other light particles. This also indicates that Lorentz symmetry breaks down at the Planck scale. The Planck mass particle stands absolutely still and is invariant and the same as observed across different reference frames.

References

- [1] E. G. Haug. The Planck mass particle finally discovered! The true God particle! Good bye to the point particle hypothesis! <http://vixra.org/abs/1607.0496>, 2016.
- [2] E. G. Haug. A new solution to Einstein’s relativistic mass challenge based on maximum frequency. <http://vixra.org/abs/1609.0083>, 2016.
- [3] E. G. Haug. The gravitational constant and the Planck units: A simplification of the quantum realm. *Physics Essays Vol. 29, No. 4*, 2016.
- [4] E. G. Haug. The ultimate limits of the relativistic rocket equation: The Planck photon rocket. *Acta Astronautica*, 136, 2017.
- [5] E. G. Haug. Can the Planck length be found independent of big G? *Applied Physics Research*, 9(6), 2017.
- [6] E. G. Haug. *Unified Revolution: New Fundamental Physics*. Oslo, E.G.H. Publishing, 2014.
- [7] M. Planck. *Naturlische Masseinheiten*. Der Königlich Preussischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften, p. 479, 1899.
- [8] M. Planck. *Vorlesungen über die Theorie der Wärmestrahlung*. Leipzig: J.A. Barth, p. 163, see also the English translation “The Theory of Radiation” (1959) Dover, 1906.
- [9] W. Heisenberg. Über den anschaulichen inhalt der quantentheoretischen kinematik und mechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, (43):172–198, 1927.
- [10] E. H. Kennard. Zur quantenmechanik einfacher bewegungstypen”. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, (44):326–352, 1927.