return to updates

More Proof from HuffPost that Physics is Dead

by Miles Mathis

First published April 24, 2013

An article at HuffingtonPost.com today by Victor Stenger proves how stonedead physics really is. We are told Stenger is a bestselling author with a PhD in physics, so he should be able to do highschool math, right? Nope. In an exclamatory article about space travel, Stenger proposes a rocketship accelerating at *g* for 7 years. Although 7 years is the time period implied by his thought problem, he goes beyond it to say this:

Now, building a spaceship capable of accelerating at one *g* for 14 years is not within any known technology, but we can't prove it's impossible.

So he has unwittingly doubled his own cluelessness for us. Why? Because we can show very easily that both scenarios are strictly impossible, even according to mainstream math and theory—math and theory he should know if he is a bestselling author on such subjects. Let us take the smaller time period, to start. If we let any object accelerate (from rest) at *g* for 7 years, we would use the simple equation v=at. That equation is in chapter one of your high school physics book. In my high school physics book, it is on p. 21. At an acceleration of $9.8 m/s^2$ for 7 years, we find a final velocity of about 2.16 billion m/s, which is 7.2 times the speed of light. If we use Stenger's second number and let the rocketship accelerate at *g* for 14 years, we find a final velocity of 14.4c. So I have just "proved it is impossible." According to mainstream theory, you cannot match or exceed the speed of light. The mass of his rocketship would have gone to infinity after less than one year, and it is pretty difficult to accelerate something with an infinite mass.

Amazing he doesn't know that, since he is quoting Relativity equations as if he is an expert in the field. Which should make us suspicious of his other math. Although that math is more catholic, it is also wrong. He tells us that although 1,200 years would have passed on the Earth, only 14 years pass in his rocketship. This is just bad post-Einstein science fiction, based on math Einstein himself never did. Einstein didn't believe in the twin paradox, and this sort of science-fiction math was only done by physicists after Einstein who didn't understand his fields or math, and who wanted attention. Although I accept Einstein's transforms (for the most part), I have shown this twin paradox math is fudged. It is nothing more than bad vector math. It makes for good movies like *Planet of the Apes*, but it is terrible physics and worse math.

To show you what I mean, notice that Stenger just plops down an equation for time dilation, applies it to his thought problem, and then *assumes* that the dilated time he calculates is the time the people on the rocketship experience. It isn't, and it never was for Einstein. In a Relativity transform, you

transform from t to t', where t is the time on the planet, say, and t' is the time on the rocketship. However, according to Einstein's own definitions, you have to do your transform from one spot or the other. In other words, you have to pick a point of view. That is what Relativity means. Your numbers are *relative* to the place you are measuring from. If you are doing transforms, there is no universal space or time, so it *matters* where you measure from. You can measure from anywhere, and there is no privileged spot, but you still have to pick one. The transforms are not done from the field, they are done from some specific point-of-view, so you have to pick. OK, so say we pick one of the two planets to measure from. We either do the calculation from the Earth or from the distant planet we are traveling to. The time t then become the time of that home planet. And in that case, t' becomes the time of the rocketship *as measured* from that planet. Time t' is how the data from the rocketship will *look* to people on the planet. That data will be skewed relative to t, which is why we need a transform in the first place.

Which means t' is in the data only. The data is not equivalent to the time they are experiencing on the rocketship. The time t' has been skewed by having to travel to the planet in the field of light. It is the speed and the distance that has skewed it. Well, if it is skewed, it is *not* what they are experiencing on the rocketship. On the rocketship, they are experiencing local time, which has not been skewed by speed and distance. On the rocketship, they have no speed relative to light. Remember, according to Einstein's own postulates, every object measures itself as stopped relative to light. Every object measures light to go c, therefore every object measures itself going zero relative to light. Therefore, the rocketship measures itself to be undilated. Its local time is not t', it is t. The time t' is only in the data that the planet is receiving. The time t' does not belong to the rocketship itself. The time t' belongs to the data skewed by the velocity and distance it has had to travel.

This means that there is no twin paradox and no time differential between the rocketship and the planet. If the planet has aged 1,200 years, so has the rocketship.

I have been showing this for over a decade now, and it amazes me how few people can penetrate it. It is straightforward and completely logical, so I don't understand how the mistake has stood for so many decades. It was just idiotic to apply t' to the time experienced by the moving object, since that application contradicted the definitions and postulates of the field. Einstein himself never did it and never confirmed it. So how has this story stood for 80 years? I suppose it has stood because it is a good story. It is sexy, thrilling, and it leads to good movies. Given that, why would we wish to lose it? If fiction is more interesting than fact, give us fiction, I guess.

We see this at *HuffPost*, which will publish science fiction but which will not publish anything that limits itself to facts. The readers don't care if the math adds up, they just want to hear a good story about time travel. And Stenger is prepared to give them that, since it pays much better than real physics. Real physics pays nothing, as I know too well. But science fiction pays very well. Some get paid for writing articles and books promoting it, and others get paid even better via taxdollars for the really big science fiction projects—like the Higgs project.