

E=mc² is rubbish!

June 17, 2013 at 9:23am

Public

mass

/mas/

Noun

A coherent, typically large body of matter with no definite shape.

Adjective

Relating to, done by, or affecting large numbers of people or things.

Verb

Assemble or cause to assemble into a mass or as one body: "both countries began massing troops in the region".

Synonyms

noun. heap - multitude - crowd - bulk - pile - lump

adjective. massive - wholesale

verb. collect - gather - accumulate - muster - assemble

en-er-gy

/'enərdʒi/

Noun

The strength and vitality required for sustained physical or mental activity.

A feeling of possessing such strength and vitality.

Synonyms

power - vigour - vigor - vim - zip - strength - pep

Which came first mass or energy? Did they simultaneously come into existence? This is NOT what our Creator teaches us. Our Creator said Let there be... and it was so. Energy is first indicated in the void. Energy necessarily brought mass into existence. The two cannot therefore be equivalent in any way.

Is a certain amount of energy present in all mass?

How about an object that on earth would weigh 100 mega-tons at its surface? Take that object and place it in the 4th dimension (which is what all time and space exists in). So out away from other objects and so far out in the void that it receives no heat (energy) from anyone or anything. This object drops in temperature to absolute zero. Does it have mass? Can it be weighed? Is its mass exactly the same as it was on the surface of the earth? Motionless, even its atomic structure motionless at absolute zero, there it is. The motionless mass exists doing no measurable work; no measurable force just an inorganic mass frozen in time and space. How much energy does this motionless mass have? Is it the same as it was on the surface of the earth at earth's ambient temperature? Would it be the same as mass that weighed likewise at the surface of the earth of unstable atomic structure? Can mass even exist coherently without a certain amount of energy present to hold it together? At absolute zero does the non-moving particles of an atom simply disintegrate no longer showing the covalent bonds (energy in the motion that establishes these bonds) that once held the lump or mass of whatever together? Or of chemical reactions like the sun and stars?

While entire mathematical and scientific formulae have evolved attempting to reconcile this faulty theory; more will only continue to try in VAIN to prove it. Why? because it is fundamentally FALSE. Energy and Mass are independent terms! They are in NO WAY equivalent! It is as simple as Life and Death. A person dies and breathes their last breath. Their spirit separates from the mass of their corporal form. Where now is the energy? It is with the spirit irrespective of the mass of their decaying flesh.

The Power/Energy that created the universe does not want people to be confused or baffled in an endless quest to try and create some kind of equivalency that simply does not exist. Energy exists irrespective of mass. Not all mass has equal measurable amounts of energy; to attempt to describe a relationship between the two mathematically would result in an infinite list for as many different types and amounts of mass as exist in the Universe. This notion is false at its conception and in the observable universe and is why all the formulae in vain only attempt to define some equivalency between the two when there is none.

It may sound cool... the speed of light squared; that is. As if throwing an intangible, inconceivable constant into the mix somehow has anything whatsoever to do with it. What if he had stated it was the speed of light cubed? or to the 12th power? would we then think all the more "what a genius"? A popular saying sums up most of what I think of preposterous scientific theories (especially the theory of evolution) in that we must remember some people adhere to it. The arrogance of science that attempts to rend away from declared manifest truth by our Creator is summed up in the expression, "If you can't dazzle them with your brilliance, baffle them with your bullshit." So with the opinions of billions, remember to seek the Ultimate Authority who will not deceive you in any way. <http://www.extremetech.com/extreme/150207-chinese-physicists-measure-speed-of-einsteins-spooky-action-at-a-distance-at-least-10000-times-faster-than-light>

No, my friends, it is a fine thing to imagine; it is after all evidence of energy (the presence of our spirits) and is what children of the Creator do; as they were created in His Image. But to equivate/equivocate in any way energy and mass is to fly in the face of the reality our Creator made for us. Any one of his children can imagine all kinds of things but it is God Almighty that ultimately defines and is Truth. It may be true that it takes energy to give the resemblance of matter and mass its existence as our Creator has taught us that substance/mass is the evidence of faith/energy such that all mass is a depiction of a certain amount of energy; that is the faith that presents it. This in no way creates an equivalency between the two for the same faith/energy that sustains the mass can eradicate it at will. All mass can vanish away but energy will still exist <http://biblehub.com/matthew/24-35.htm>;

it is the Power that brought mass into existence and that Power is Eternal. Whereas, mass and matter we are told by our Creator is not; as all things visible are passing away. http://biblehub.com/2_corinthians/4-18.htm Energy is invisible and mass is not. <http://biblehub.com/hebrews/11-3.htm> These terms are in no way interchangeable; it was folly to suggest such from the onset and time people everywhere realized $E=mc^2$ is rubbish! (squared - there is no superscript function in this word processing software) "energy equals mass multiplied by the variable speed of light squared" is absolute rubbish!

Michael Swenson <https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/so-you-think-the-big-bang-is-scientific/620654451346851>(this is not a comment attacking anyone's personal views; just to present another perspective on the topic)

So You Think the Big Bang is Scientific?

Public indoctrination has gotten people to think there is such a thing as being ...See More

By: Michael Swenson

Michael Swenson exactly why I point out how obvious it is for ANYONE to see; (not just scientists). help people not to present themselves as <http://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/mentally-challenged/575010789244551> by teaching the Truth!<http://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/evidence-of-god-our-creator/568134419932188> and <http://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/the-sufferings-of-christ-a-treatise-on-repentance-and-forgiveness/556880667724230> spinning galaxies, spinning solar systems, spinning planets, SO MANY of them and can you tell me how a single explosion causes that? WHEN THE OBVIOUS disproves your "theory"; why hold onto it.

Mentally Challenged

I have no personal animosity toward mentally challenged individuals; I just thin...See More

By: Michael Swenson

Bill Smith the "explosion" ...didn't cause spinning planets..gravity is responsible for that.

Michael Swenson @Bill Smith; so according to you... gravity caused galaxies, planets, solar systems to spin around the universal origin of the big bang and each other... care to elaborate how?

Bill Smith The big bang itself didn't make planets or galaxies spin...gravity ..the bang doesn't have a centre ...infinity can't be divided ...half infinity is infinity.

Bill Smith nice to meet you by the way.

Michael Swenson and I'm asking you to explain how "gravity" caused exploding bits of matter throughout the universe the size of whole galaxies down to tiny asteroids to all just start spinning in countless ways, orbits, velocities, directions (universe according to Bill Smith - planets have cores, atoms have nuclei, even galaxies have galactic centers, in fact all matter we observe has dimension and shape, center of mass, BUT NOT THE UNIVERSE!)

Bill Smith It didn't explode bits off matter into the universe..the universe was created ..it wasn't an empty space waiting to be filled.. Matter came much later when the 4 fundamental forces applied to the first 12 particles...hope this helped.

Michael Swenson it helped me see you have absolutely no idea what you're talking about.

Bill Smith Gravity is the interaction of mass and space time..gravity doesn't necessarily need a spinning object...you create gravity...your mass in space time creates gravity..every object of mass creates gravity.

Bill Smith Yes galaxies have centres...but there is no location for the centre of the universe known presently.

Bill Smith You're posting...then editing ...im happy to discuss your points.

Michael Swenson yes, I regularly edit my comments; mostly because of how many people intentionally choose to misunderstand them, or for typos, or grammar, spelling, etc especially when I am chatting with people who have already shown being in favor of debating just for the sake of it; even when they have no facts to justify their position... when the mezzos flies about the shazbut and carmudgens the padroogle, then we get intermittent

flashes of matter/anti-matter circling the nebulous imaginations of pure fantasies! I actually presented scientific evidence in my note Bill, did you bother to read it before commenting? <http://biblehub.com/proverbs/18-13.htm>

Proverbs 18:13 To answer before listening-- that is folly and shame.
biblehub.com

Paul Wells Bill Smith just said the universe was CREATED.....smh....by whom?

Bill Smith I wont say you dont know what youre talking about because youve posted lots of links to say things on your behalf. I hope this doesnt descend into silliness.

Bill Smith The unoverse was created by the big bang..yes i said this.

Michael Swenson Bill the note and the universe speaks for itself. The expansion has been observed (galactic expansion throughout the universe) it is only a matter of time before scientists extrapolate where time and matter intersects (where all that galactic expansion is distancing from) and when they do then they will have found the origin of time and space (origin of the universe) but to use a rather scientifically undefined term to say that it suddenly caused matter ubiquitously to start spinning is pure imagination with not one shred of science to support it. I find people just love to debate out of ignorance; and I have never understood why. My note actually cites sound scientific support. not pure fiction like the big bang theory and your comments.

Bill Smith Its an infinite universe ...it has no centre ..infinity cannot be divided..half of infinity is still infinity.When the particles made atoms (governed by the 4 fundamental forces) gravity created stars ... Im sorry you think im ignorant its ok have a great day.

Michael Swenson The Eternal GOD has no Beginning and No End; but the Universe, (Time and Space) Most Definitely did. (have a Beginning, an Origin) Our Creator names every star <http://biblehub.com/psalms/147-4.htm> and knows their number. (Matter, Mass, Cosmos are not infinite) There is a fixed amount of matter in Space, that Matter was brought into Visible existence at the moment of the first instance of Time. Galactic expansion (the gravity waves that emanate from the Origin of the Universe with the expanding galaxies (expanding from that same Origin of Time and Space - throughout the Visible Universe) has an exact specified total finite mass (however enormous). The universe is not infinite no more than any visible matter is (everything we observe visibly had a beginning and all that is visible has an end -http://biblehub.com/2_corinthians/4-18.htm) stars burn out, collapse, explode, covalent bonds disintegrate, into ever cooler, smaller particulates until they are invisible altogether. As our Creator tells us so plainly in His Word.<http://biblehub.com/matthew/24-35.htm> GOD is Infinite, Eternal, the universe is not. But my posted note did not touch on this topic; instead it presented simple laws of motion (scientific laws) that explain what we observe in the universe; instead of fiction and fantasies like the big bang theory and wistful notions of rather undefined "gravity" suddenly causing all the massive variables involved with what we observe; regarding all the spinning masses in the universe.

Psalms 147:4 He determines the number of the stars and calls them each by name.
biblehub.com

He tells the number of the stars; he calls them all by their names. he When I consider your heavens, the work of your fingers, the moon ?

Bill Smith This doesnt describe the conditions of the universe. What time scale are these new and dying stars subject to ? they dont become invisible when they die. Gravity is a known measured observable force like magnetism or the nuclear forces.. Your description of the universe isnt actually accurate.

Bill Smith the laws of motion are universal known for hundreds of years .lightspeed is constant ..its all simple stuff really Micheal..

Michael

Swenson<https://www.facebook.com/photo.php?fbid=451991028213195&set=a.115635768515391.22520.100002069048072&type=3&theater> you might read up a little: <https://www.google.com/search...> Do a little more research Bill before thinking I haven't been truthful with you.

Timeline Photos

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u-xUAC9ya3o> and <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r...> See More

By: Michael Swenson

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, matter attracts matter. That's gravity. The early universe had a very slightly uneven distribution of matter which means that the gravity between particles wasn't cancelled out so they move. Computer models have demonstrated how this slight imbalance causes particles to coalesce into larger bodies. This continues for millions of years and galaxies, stars and planets are formed.

By the way, the inflation is not galactic, it's universal. Everything, matter, time and space inflated in this period.

Michael Swenson "lightspeed is constant" NO! that's another thing among much of the fiction you have written - <https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/emc2-is-rubbish/485479484864349>

E=mc² is rubbish!

mass /mas/ Noun A coherent, typically large body of matter with no definite sh...See More

By: Michael Swenson

Bill Smith some stars explode leaving evidence some become blackholes ..neutron stars quasars ..they rarely become invisible.

Michael Swenson "Michael, matter attracts matter. That's gravity. The early universe had a very slightly uneven distribution of matter which means that the gravity between particles wasn't cancelled out so they move. Computer models have demonstrated how this slight imbalance causes particles to coalesce into larger bodies. This continues for millions of years and galaxies, stars and planets are formed." Wow! how many people write such amazing unsubstantiated fiction with not one shred of scientific support! this coalesced space dust just formed all kinds of mass we observed and PRESTO! some start spinning this way and that all on their own! (And attempt to respond and comment on a topic they didn't even bother to read)! (the original post) "By the way, the inflation is not galactic, it's universal. Everything, matter, time and space inflated in this period." Uh YEAH, you've said nothing new there... do any of you READ the comments and notes before replying to them?

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, Einstein's theory has withstood every test it has been subjected to since he first published it. If you had proof that it was wrong, you'd have a Nobel Prize on your table and you would be one of the most famous scientists in history.

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, you called it galactic inflation.

Michael Swenson Stuart, what utter nonsense! It has generated endless modifications of formulae BECAUSE IT IS TOTAL RUBBISH! the speed of light is NOT constant! Light can be bent, stopped, sped up, etc. etc. scientific fact; if you had read the note you would have seen the proof. thus his fundamental theory and especially the formulae that energy equals mass multiplied by the speed of light squared is total rubbish; completely false. energy and mass are in no way equivalent terms they just aren't. Any attempt at trying to equivocate them is sheer fantasy and a waste of time when they are completely dissimilar terms.

Stuart Pittaway VI Your original post states that the Big Bang theory doesn't explain the observed motion in the universe. I'm sorry but that's just wrong. The observed motion is one of the main reasons the theory was arrived at in the first place. If it couldn't explain the motion, it would have been discarded.

Michael Swenson And it should be as the note details.

Michael Swenson Are you aware of how much "scientific" rubbish has gone by the wayside?http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superseded_scientific_theories

Superseded scientific theories - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

en.wikipedia.org

A superseded, or obsolete, scientific theory is a scientific theory that mainstr...See More

Stuart Pittaway VI Please show me how light can speed up.

Michael Swenson <https://www.google.com/search...once> stopped photons captured can be bombarded with other photons and re-accelerated; but it's more obvious than this. All matter; regardless of size or mass; no matter how small (even photons and electrons) can be acted upon (sped up, slowed down) It is observed throughout the universe, just not taught in public schools predominately.

light has been stopped - Google Search

www.google.com

Stuart Pittaway VI All you are showing is that it must be slowed before it can be accelerated. The speed of light is constant in a vacuum and this is the cosmic limit. It can be slowed by interactions with matter, hence the vacuum note.

Stuart Pittaway VI I think you have missed the importance of the 'in a vacuum' addition to the phrase.

Michael Swenson nonsense; Light is no more constant than anything moving in time and space; it is subject to the same laws of motion and gravitational forces the planets, atoms, electrons, ions, etc. are.

Stuart Pittaway VI Exactly, so we are agreed. That is why the phrase is 'the speed of light is constant in a vacuum'.

Michael Swenson my original point $E=mc^2$ is rubbish

Stuart Pittaway VI No, you think that because you don't understand the physics. As I've said, it has withstood every test it has been subjected to. You haven't tested it.

Stuart Pittaway VI Repeatedly calling it rubbish doesn't make it so.

Michael Swenson Stuart, you just acknowledged the scientific fact that light isn't constant! That's one of the assumed premises of the formula - it is clearly a FALSE one; therefore: said formula is rubbish! (besides the most obvious fact that energy and mass are in no way terms that can be equivocated); despite any and all who might fantasize doing so.

Stuart Pittaway VI I have made it clear that light is constant in a vacuum.

Do you honestly believe that every physicist in the last century is wrong and you are right? That every one of them has made one simple mistake that only you have noticed? Your confidence is not matched by your knowledge.

Stuart Pittaway VI Energy and mass are inexplicably linked. Einstein proved it.

Stuart Pittaway VI Were they not, there would be no such thing as nuclear power. Are you suggesting that nuclear power stations don't provide energy?

Michael Swenson yes, you have hypothesized that whatever speed light might enter a vacuum, it would remain constant. But show me where such a thing is observed in all the universe. Conjecture is one thing; facts are another and the facts are that light throughout the visible universe has to deal with the same laws of motion and gravity all visible creation (matter and mass) does. It is subject ultimately to the WORD of GOD which is really what science is observing when it sees matter traveling as spiral waves, or sine waves, or vibrations and especially when matter responds to resonate frequencies. But even though you acknowledge it is only constant in an imagined condition it is NOT constant in the reality of the universe it travels through; as such the formula is complete rubbish.

Stuart Pittaway VI I'll be honest, for years I'd heard the equation but didn't really understand the science behind it. I thoroughly recommend this book. It makes a very difficult subject digestible to the layman and shows the errors in your objections. <http://www.amazon.co.uk/gp/aw/d/0306819112>

Michael Swenson the fact energy exists within matter and it exists without matter; does not mean mass and energy are equal. or can be set as such by pulling a fictional equation out of thin air. Suppose he had said it was the speed of light cubed or the speed of light to the tenth power; confused masses would have still bought it just like all the rubbish they still buy; whenever anyone says "scientists have discovered..." or SCIENCE says (which is the modern idol of all who deny the existence of the Creator); because they have no one to trust as a source of accurate knowledge but someone who can baffle them with b.s. like the widely acclaimed super genius Einstein.

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, please read the book. At the moment, you do not understand what you're criticising and and you're making bold assertions from ignorance.

Michael Swenson And I reply please read my notes they are based not only on a lifetime of research but on direct revelations from God Almighty. It is you who have demonstrated ignorance in that you cling to something that has clearly been disproven. Light has factually been stopped, therefore it FACTUALLY is NOT constant; THEREFORE said discussed formula is false.

Mark Brace Are you really claiming that relativity is wrong? Really? You do realize that if the speed of light is not constant (which when talked about is always speed of light in a vacuum, maximum speed of all information in this universe) the universe would basically be destroyed?

Michael Swenson no proof whatsoever of the many things you have just asserted Mark yes, energy and mass are in no way equivalent terms read the note that clearly details why. yes, the speed of light is not constant, and all attempts to define it as such or measure its speed is always done under certain assumed conditions that are not in any way ubiquitous about space and time throughout the universe. just because mankind is finally using light to transmit information; does not mean that is the maximum speed information travels by; especially when Our Creator is both Omniscient and Omnipresent. <http://biblehub.com/ephesians/4-6.htm> and <http://biblehub.com/colossians/1-17.htm>

Ephesians 4:6 one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all.

biblehub.com

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. Peace be to the brothers, and love with faith, from God the Father ?

Stuart Pittaway VI If e didn't = mc^2 , Hiroshima would have had a large metal thing land in the city centre. I can't put it any plainer than that. History proves that you're wrong.

Stuart Pittaway VI I read some of your notes, Michael. I had to stop, they're just nonsense.

Stuart Pittaway VI Feel free to demonstrate how nuclear fusion works without relativity.

Michael Swenson doesn't surprise me you would stop reading my notes; you probably haven't read the Holy Bible either as our Creator tells us http://biblehub.com/1_corinthians/2-14.htm but that does not mean because you choose to ignore information, scientific facts, that any of my premises or conclusions are false or nonsense; but when you reject facts for fiction, then you are a person who cannot be reasoned with. fusion can be explained easily without relativity; you just have to look at how nuclear fusion actually occurs: <http://www.world-nuclear.org/.../nuclear-fusion-power/> and when you look at the physical structures and energy involved. You see electro-magnetic energy, you see natural and man-made radioactive isotopes and you see principles of element creation by applying such high powered energy to these unstable atomic structures of these radioactive elements. Each of these elements have various levels of energy within them and according to the kind of substance involved (their mass however large or small playing a variable role in the energy produced (not constant and not the same for all substances) as anyone can read. And when they read the detail process of just how a modern nuclear fusion reactor actually works you will find not one mention of relativity.

1 Corinthians 2:14 The person without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the...

biblehub.com

But the natural man receives not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are f...See More

Stuart Pittaway VI I've just done a little research to hopefully clear this up for you. 'c' is a constant in nature, it's the speed that nothing can exceed. It also happens to be the speed at which light travels in a vacuum. So 'c' specifically refers to the speed of light in a vacuum, the universal constant. Regardless of what we can do to light, 'c' doesn't change. Applying your brakes slows down the car but doesn't change the speed limit of the road. Has this helped?

Michael Swenson there you go, you just saw actual evidence that light has been stopped, that it is obviously not constant (no matter who or what says otherwise) but instead of changing your thinking to line up with revealed truth; you chose to desperately go find some confirmation bias to make you feel better about religiously still holding onto fiction. Therefore, you are totally wasting my time as it is obvious you are unwilling or unable to face reality good-bye.

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, you claim to be smarter than every physicist in the last century and then say that I can't be reasoned with?

In addition to the book I linked, I suggest you look up the Dunning-Kruger Effect.

Mark Brace It should be noted that hypothetically you could have things faster than light, they just could never slow down below that limit. Its kinda possible, but extremely unlikely. Whatever the case c, the max speed of information in this universe and the speed of light in a vacuum is indeed a constant.

Michael Swenson Stuart your lack of ability to admit that modern scientists in stopping light disproves the theory (not just because light is not constant) but because mass and energy are completely fundamentally dissimilar terms, leaves me to conclude that your desperate pleas are nothing more than common psychological denial and I am but a student of our Creator; but most people you seem to idolize got their notions solely from imaginations (that have in fact been soundly disproven). If you won't bother to read my notes that do so; why do you think after having examined these topics in depth and having received direct knowledge from our Creator and have shown you clearly with your own eyes; light is NOT constant (regardless of how many today falsely claim otherwise) would I read any recommendation by you? You may not be able to face the facts; but that does not mean I am going to choose to live in your delusions; or anyone else's just to make you comfortable. You can comment all you want; your refusal of evidence means it is a complete waste of my time to discuss this any further with you. I will not be responding to your rants any further. I am only not blocking you; to give you a chance to reconsider the factual evidence presented rather than holding onto your disproven religious notions.

Mark Brace Michael, why is it hard for you to understand that when physicist talk about the speed of light it is always the maximum speed of light?

Michael Swenson Mark, why is it hard for you to understand that is pure conjecture and imagination (the very notion of "maximum speed of light") and saying "physicist" is not impressive when they are just fallible humans like everyone else:http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superseded_scientific_theories

Superseded scientific theories - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

en.wikipedia.org

A superseded, or obsolete, scientific theory is a scientific theory that mainstr...See More

Mark Brace Michael, we are not talking about a scientific theory here, it is a simple observation, a fact of nature.

Michael Swenson apparently you didn't bother to read the comments above showing light is not constant and anyone claiming they have discovered it's "maximum speed" is talking out of the same imaginations of those who write little books that begin with "once upon a time..."

Mark Brace Michael, for the fourth time I have to tell you that when physicist are talking about the speed of light it is almost always speed of light in a VACUUM. That is what the famous c in the equation stand for, speed of light in a vacuum, which is also the maximum speed of information in this universe.

Michael Swenson and Mark for the last time light is not constant. whenever it enters this fictional imagined vacuum; whether it was stopped, slowed or accelerated previously (it is only then assumed/presumed to be constant in that it is imagined there are no other forces or energy (like gravity anywhere nearby) to act upon said photons traveling through this fictional imagined vacuum). As such, the theory is obviously flawed; because light is only constant in a fictional imagined setting; not in the universe or in reality. the speed of light is a variable; and energy and mass are in no way equivalent or can be equivocated (except in wild imaginations of those who are unable to face the facts of the observable universe). end of story.

Mark Brace None of that matters, what is taken into calculations is the speed of light in a vacuum, where it is not disturbed. It seems to me you do not understand that part, right?

Michael Swenson "None of that matters..." = "reality doesn't matter; only what I can imagine does" = psychological denial

Mark Brace Michael, in those calculations it does not matter, the same way that the speed of an average chicken does not matter when you measure how high you are.

Michael Swenson Mark, everything you are stating is that those calculations are based on pure imaginations; not facts.

Mark Brace Sure Michael. Next time you try to use a GPS remember it depends on that imagination. Call us when you measure something faster than light.

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, light itself and the maximum speed it can travel are not the same thing. Your objection is based on light but special relativity is based on the universal constant 'c'. It just happens to also be the maximum speed that light can travel. 'c' is the rule, light is a particle that must obey it.

Stuart Pittaway VI Whatever can be done to photons of light has absolutely no bearing on 'c', none at all.

Michael Swenson Alright, I'll bite; seeing that it seems at least part of you both are searching for answers. Suppose today, super genius (let's call him Izik) comes along and suppose today he claims that v is the new maximum velocity or imagined constant. but then all those who favor c say NO! it's "c" (BECAUSE WE SAY SO) is the maximum velocity universal constant. But then Izik presents his "scientific evidence" that c is nothing more than what it is.... an imaginary figure that a bunch of people have chosen to agree on. And lo and behold Izik's "v" is actually must faster! Both of you are having extreme difficulty realizing much of "science" is actually science fiction. there's a popular saying among those who know better about human nature in general and it is "if you can't dazzle 'em with your brilliance, baffle 'em with your b.s." and sadly much of the masses fail to comprehend that more people (especially "scientists") have made a name for themselves that way; than those who actually are seriously concerned about facts and reality. Again, take a look at some of the things "scientists" once believed... <https://www.google.com/webhp?q=scientists+once+believed> and then think and meditate on what they are obviously assuming in the theories many believe today. When you can see with your own eyes that reality disproves those theories; then you should discard them; if you actually favor science, facts and truth over disproven fantasies.

scientists once believed - Google Search
www.google.com

Mark Brace comes along and suppose today he claims that v is the new maximum velocity or imagined constant - He would be wrong. Simple as that. We have measurement, experiments, everything confirming beyond any doubt what the maximum speed is, Michael. Calculations with it are incredibly precise. He cannot have any evidence of that any more than I can have evidence that the Sun is actually tree times more distant from us than we now think it is.

Stuart Pittaway VI But there's nothing to suggest that Izik's theory is possible and the explanation as to why is in the book I linked. When you read it, you'll understand why 'c' is the limit and why it's constant. You're quite right, many scientific beliefs have been overturned in light of new discoveries. That's how science works. But just because once upon a time some people believed that base metals could be turned into gold does not mean that all science is wrong. It just means the weaker hypotheses get discarded and the stronger ones, like special relativity, stand the test.

Michael Swenson just like I said... "he's wrong! because we say so!" with no evidence whatsoever to support your own claims or held beliefs; other than present popular opinions; that even you acknowledge are defined by imagined non-existent settings; in a way that is completely out of touch with the observable universe.

Mark Brace Michael, once again, this is not some assumption with no evidence, this is an observed fact of nature with all possible calculations supporting it and being utilized in many technologies. Give me just one good argument against it. There are none. That is why it is a "popular opinion". Reality most commonly is.

Michael Swenson and it has not stood the test. you are still in denial of the fact that light has NEVER been observed at a "maximum velocity" (leastwise, by anyone but our Creator; who can do all things; including set a maximum velocity, if He so chose; but nowhere have I found He has done so or declared any intention of doing so). the speed of light as observed; only at velocities documented to date and/or imagined. furthermore, you KNOW light is subject to laws of motion and gravity; thus you KNOW it can be slowed, bent, reflected, refracted, scattered, even stopped; and only travels at this "maximum velocity constant" in the imaginations of those who believe in that fictional notion.

Stuart Pittaway VI 'c' is 186,000 miles per second squared. That huge number is the universal constant. Just think of it as a number and disregard any mention of light because it's confusing the point. So $e=mc^2$, which means that energy of a particle is equal to the mass of the particle multiplied by 186,000 miles per second multiplied by 186,000 miles per second. This is why so much energy is given off in nuclear reactions by so little matter.

Michael Swenson and rewriting the disproven theory is supposed to convey?

Mark Brace Michael, I will try to explain this just once more: light has nothing to do with the formula. Nothing. Speed does. All massless particles travel at the speed of light, the maximum speed of information in this universe, which is also the speed of light. Lets say something can in fact travel faster. It is hypothetically possible. It does not matter. It would not change the reality of those formulas. I cannot make this any more clear.

Stuart Pittaway VI //and it has not stood the test. you are still in denial that light has NEVER been observed at a "maximum velocity" only at velocities documented to date and/or imagined. furthermore you KNOW light is subject to laws of motion and gravity//

No one is denying that but it isn't light itself that's at the heart of relativity, it's the universal constant 'c' which just so happens to ALSO be the maximum speed that light can travel. You're getting confused by the term 'speed of light', light itself has nothing to do with the equation, so being able to slow it down makes absolutely no difference to relativity.

Michael Swenson and that is absurdly laughable! It is the equivalent of saying I or anyone can choose to declare that all "massless particles" travel at an imaginary fixed constant maximum speed (just because I or anyone CLAIMS to have "observed" it) and then say, it really doesn't matter if it's true or not; because we like our formulae; even if it's inaccurate or not based on observable facts. (and furthermore claim then that is the maximum speed "information" can travel- what nonsense! - you are only limited by two factors in this universe- our Almighty Creator and your own thinking) What is true is that energy is present in matter; some matter and mass is more unstable than others; some energy and mass is more radioactive; throws off more ions, radiates more "energy" of one kind or another. to find that there exists energy within mass; even lot's of energy is not being debated; what is being debated is that mass and energy is an equivalency and can be described by something that is an imagined constant (not based on reality); just wishful thinking and some miniscule observations compared to the vastness of the universe. the theory is rubbish; it's not based on facts; but imaginations. I have already shown and even your own comments confirm it. (regardless of your religious passion for it; so obviously duly noted; as you have insisted and stated)

Mark Brace Michael, it was not a baseless declaration, it is what every observation ever says. We like our formulas because they make accurate predictions. What you are saying is basically "I don't understand it so it is not true in any way, shape or form".

Mark Brace Did you have any physics? Ever?

Stuart Pittaway VI Michael, it's based on observation and mathematics. It hasn't just been plucked from the air and you would understand this if you bothered to look. I've shown you where you can start but you reject it because it might challenge your false ingrained misunderstanding.

Michael Swenson no what you are saying is that you want to adhere to fiction in the name of science. just because you (or others) have taken a few measurements of light in controlled settings does not mean you can suddenly announce that all mass or "massless particles" are limited by c maximum velocity. that is BASELESS regardless of any assertions otherwise. it is as BASELESS as those who talk about "billions of years ago" as if they were there. I understand perfectly your claims; what you fail to acknowledge is that your claims have been clearly disproven as FALSE and the formula based on conjecture; not facts!

Stuart Pittaway VI That's just ridiculous, Michael.

Ok, what evidence would it take to convince you?

Mark Brace You see Michael, most people when they have such a question (How do we know what the maximum speed of things is?) do not conclude that they "have taken a few measurements of light in controlled settings" and do not know the truth and its all some kind of a conspiracy and all those formulas (That we use every day for almost everything and are correct in all conceivable ways) are wrong. You claimed many times that we were clearly disproven false. When? Show me these experiment, papers. Where are they?

Stuart Pittaway VI Incidentally, it is a fact (yes, a fact, for I have seen it done) that the universal constant can be measured using cheese on toast and a microwave oven. This is an undisputed fact. I'm not joking, just Google it.

Michael Swenson convince me of a disproven theory? it can't be done. It has been disproven. it is rubbish. you both have acknowledged that c is an imaginary constant that on one hand has nothing to do with observable facts like the speed of light; and on the other just happens to be the speed of light squared or defined/ as pertains to - light can and all "massless particles" be bounded by the chosen defined limit of "c". there is no evidence you can present to prove it is fact; when you acknowledge already it is a selected, designated constant chosen and agreed upon rather than based on actual velocities of anything in the universe.

Stuart Pittaway VI It isn't imaginary, I've just told you how to measure it yourself.

Stuart Pittaway VI <http://www.bbc.co.uk/dna/place-london/plain/A32873493>

Mark Brace Michal, AGAIN, when physicists talk about the speed of light they talk about speed of light IN A VACUUM. This is an observable fact. I give up. Read a book.

Michael Swenson now I know you both are full of it! cheese on toast in a microwave proves the "universal constant" I would be laughing right now if it wasn't so sad!

Michael Swenson Mark AGAIN I can talk about the wazu in the placard of the bazu it doesn't make it an observable fact; no matter how many people agree to call it such.

Stuart Pittaway VI READ THE LINK!! I'm not making this up as I go along, I'm trying to help you to understand what every physicist knows. Every source of information I've shown you you've rejected and claimed that there's no evidence. Well, you'll not find evidence if you're not willing to look, will you?

Stuart Pittaway VI Ignorance isn't the problem with you, Michael, it's the illusion of knowledge.

Stuart Pittaway VI I would understand your stubbornness if I was trying to use relativity to attack the Bible or God but I'm not. I'm just trying to help you understand what is known.

Michael Swenson I read the melted cheese experiment. the frequency is declared (assumed to be factual; not observed (and I have worked with oscilloscopes and RF energy of many types and frequencies) and any assumptions are as you know cannot deliver sound conclusions. Again, the experiment is based on generated RF energy in a controlled environment or setting. generated microwave energy; cannot suddenly conclude that this is a "universal constant" the only conclusion that can be made is what is observed that microwave energy melted the cheese (if it succeeded in doing so) at whatever distance it did based on the location of the emitter (if it was fixed).

Stuart Pittaway VI Ok, I'm done. I gave it my best shot but you are beyond help.

Michael Swenson As an electronics technician with years of study on RF energy technologies your citation of the melted cheese hardly proves a maximum velocity of "massless particles"; sorry to disappoint you. this experiment attempting to validate the theory is obviously flawed as by definition you can generate frequencies of much faster or slower wavelengths; with higher or lower amplitudes than the noted experiment you linked. face it "c" is an assumed constant based on pure conjecture not the facts that all matter even these so called "massless particles" can be sped up slowed down and I am positive can go beyond the now assumed maximum "c" BUT even if we agreed that this chosen constant maximum velocity was an actual limit; the GREATEST problem with the theory isn't just this ASSUMED maximum velocity constant; BUT that mass and energy are equivalent; when energy can exist apart from mass, these two terms are most definitely NOT equivalent. Is there energy in mass? YES of course; but are mass and energy therefore equivalent terms? NO!

Stuart Pittaway VI Now show me where I said it proved anything...

I said it measured. And, given the equipment used, it does so to a surprisingly accurate level.

There is a reason why I haven't mentioned the Bible and rarely do in these debates. It's because I don't understand it.

You should adopt the same approach with science.

Michael Swenson To assume that science does not originate with our Creator and those who know Him would be mistaken: <https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/fathers-of-the-sciences-and-great-scientific-minds-in-their-own-words/567609163318047> And the entire scientific community once thought bloodletting was a panacea, they once thought all kinds of things were

"scientific observable fact" and all I am saying is having researched the topic; the limit c is an assumed constant based on a fictional setting that does not exist (stated papers I have read regarding all such tests are about as definitive as that melted cheese experiment) claims in some of these papers include such phrases as "as the distance travelled by light in vacuum in 1/299,792,458 of a second" what shutter speed/technology on the camera did they use to capture that one? and what light source (how generated? and again on earth in a controlled environment) rather than the other imaginations of science of the dreaded black holes; so gravitationally strong that they warp time and space and such light in (at unmeasured speeds) BUT ABSOLUTELY CANNOT BE FASTER than the magic " c " because we say so! most of the responses actually acknowledge that " c " has been basically arbitrarily determined as the agreed maximum speed (while based on some tests and observations; not proven beyond a shadow of a doubt) and furthermore, then we can use said formula to determine the amount of energy in mass; but we harness said energy after altering atomic structures to make them such and why use radio-active isotopes? because of their instability. I conclude that any scientific laws that may exist are such only by two reasons 1) our Creator decided to make such to demonstrate that His Universe is in fact Created by Intelligent Design and 2) because for the moment mankind thinks they have discovered such (continued)

Fathers of the Sciences and Great Scientific Minds; In Their Own Words

Contrary to the opinion of far too many these days, science is in no opposition ...See More

Michael Swenson And when I see a formula that attempts to announce something that is not what we actually observe (matter and energy equivocations and to a degree that people think said nuclear blast has been precisely measured (rather than astonishing those who observed it personally) in other words people meddling with things (like a child poking in the dirt at some creature they just discovered) and suddenly announce that they know the precise amount of energy a certain element of certain atomic structure produces based on a chosen "universal constant" then I say show me the proof. They might know splitting an unstable substance will generate a lot of energy but to say they have precisely measured such I would have to see the data. I am not beyond teachable. My only question to you both is: Are you? For God is not limited by popular opinion; neither any of us; but we and all creation are only limited by His Word and by what we think. I for one will not agree to a stated universal constant or that the speed of "information" is limited by it; no matter how many choose to believe so. Primarily because I already know that the speed of thought can determine the speed of which anything can travel (virtually instantaneously). science is always discovering new boundaries and/or making new boundaries for themselves. I for one choose to acknowledge there are none but what our Creator tells us plainly: <http://biblehub.com/mark/9-23.htm> **when/where faith and science collide in the present and in the past it has always been the then popular opinion of science that has stood with mouths agape in astonishment at what Faith has known all along. you and your thoughts are limiting your own possibilities.**

I'll try and say this as simply as I can "massless particles" = 0 mass BUT DUE to the ASSUMPTION $e=mc^2$ is true (when all aspects of this is fundamentally false) an ENTIRELY NEW FORMULA HAS TO BE USED! you have to distinguish between an IMPOSSIBLE STATE of a "resting" "massless particle" and ATTRIBUTE TO IT as having mass BECAUSE it moves (at varying velocities). And I am telling you "massless particle" is an oxymoron; you either have mass or you have ENERGY and the TWO are NOT interchangeable terms; no matter how much you reverse $e=mc^2$! If it is a particle, if it exists, it has mass however small. just because you can't measure it doesn't entitle anyone to say it has NO mass. my point here is you all keep citing information that you THINK proves your precious beloved theory as fact when the knowledge you already possess actually shows it is false. On the one hand you say the big bang was not an explosion of mass but an explosion of energy and this energy coalesced into various types of mass that also caused all those various pieces of matter and mass to start spinning (the magic explosion of energy that created substance out of nothing - big bang and swirling galaxies, solar systems, stars, planets, etc.) so on the one hand YOU (in your fictional beliefs CLAIM first came ENERGY then came MASS (if that is true, then $e=mc^2$ is false! on the other hand you use terms like "massless particles" to describe energy just because if you didn't use such a term you would be acknowledging the actual fact (that energy exists without mass) thereby also rendering said $e=mc^2$ false! the terms you use, even the maximum universal constant ALL of you discuss are always in TERMS that DO NOT EXIST in observable reality! (why? because BOTH the big bang theory AND $e=mc^2$ are FALSE and I have shown you all plainly WHY. You are the ones unable to face the facts.

I know this is difficult to comprehend or acknowledge for some but observing that there is substantial amounts of energy within mass, matter, visible creation IN NO WAY EQUIVOCATES THE TERMS of "mass" and "energy". It is observable fact that all kinds of energy exists in our universe WITHOUT mass! mass REQUIRES energy to present it (make it visible; hold it together) but the converse is NOT TRUE; as energy most definitely exists irrespective of mass. If I were to present a "universal maximum speed" I tell you plainly that it is the speed of thought; not the speed of light; or as it is assumed at present to be the average observed speed of light in a vacuum. (attempting to set a limit that really doesn't exist is just pure folly - https://www.google.com/search?q=quantum+spooky+action+faster+than+light&rlz=1C1GIGM_enUS535US535&oq=quantum+spooky+action+faster+han+light&aqs=chrome..69i57.9871j0j8&sourceid=chrome&espm=210&es_sm=93&ie=UTF-8) I tell you that assumed constant as a maximum speed of "massless particles" and and "information" is false/fiction. Specifically the maximum universal constant is determined by the Speed of our Creator's Thoughts and that eventually, His Children will themselves travel at the speed of thought (not just tiny particles). Energy (the amount of) that exists in the Universe is determined by the Word of GOD; not mass. Words, sound frequencies brought the entire universe into existence and that energy still has mass in motion (not wistful notions of any other kind of energy like those above that speak of coalescing gases over billions of years that suddenly start spinning due to "gravity" or any other foolish attempt to deny the observable evidence that proves the Biblical Account and what I am plainly stating here. Because mass and energy are in no way equivalent terms; to attempt to do so; one would have to list an almost endless string of variables for every substance; for while there is the common energy: FAITH and the SPOKEN WORD (frequencies, spiral waves moving through the fourth dimension <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u-xUAC9ya3o>); it does not exist in the same kinds of masses or matter in equal quantities (besides the bombardment of other kinds of created energy, in different intensities, upon all kinds of various aspects of mass throughout the universe. **One more time: mass is dependent upon energy; energy is NOT dependent upon mass; therefore they are NOT equivalent terms in any way!**


<https://www.facebook.com/notes/michael-swenson/how-to-know-truth-in-a-world-of-lies/622590531153243>

Like · · Share

Alexander Braun likes this.



Michael Swenson when I state that the speed of light is an intangible, inconceivable constant what I mean is that it is NOT a constant; which is yet another fundamental reason $E=mc^2$ is total rubbish. ... as I was saying the speed of light is NOT constant <http://scitechdaily.com/liquid-crystal-matrix-slows-the-.../>



Liquid Crystal Matrix Slows Light to Less Than One Billionth of Its Top Speed

scitechdaily.com

Using embedded dye molecules in a liquid crystal matrix, an international team o...[See More](#)

August 14, 2013 at 3:21pm · Edited · Like · Remove Preview



Michael Swenson <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/einstein/expe-text.html> Janet Conrad
Experimental Physicist
Columbia University...[See More](#)



NOVA | Einstein's Big Idea | E = mc² Explained (text version) | PBS

www.pbs.org

Janet Conrad Experimental Physicist Columbia University E = mc² is a very funda...[See More](#)

March 22 at 1:55am · Edited · Like · Remove Preview



Jeremiah Ellis Hi Michael. I would like to put forth a theory that makes total sense to me about gravity. I know that the presence of mass creates the effect of gravity. But have you ever thought that maybe its not the mass, by itself that is causing this effect, but...[See More](#)

March 22 at 2:49am · Unlike · 1



Michael Swenson The entire field of "theoretical physics" is by definition fiction; some may be so gracious as to call it science fiction; but that it is all it is; nothing more. I don't care how beloved a theory is; how popular it is, IF it is factually untrue, just...[See More](#)



Superseded scientific theories - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

en.wikipedia.org

A superseded, or obsolete, scientific theory is a scientific theory that mainstr...[See More](#)

March 22 at 3:15pm · Edited · Like · 1 · Remove Preview



Michael Swenson If ANYONE has actually WEIGHED any mass moving at high velocities AND can thereby PROVE that it is actually HEAVIER than when it is at rest; please comment with the evidence of that proof (not formulas- evidence that ANYONE has actually weighed high ve...[See More](#)

March 22 at 4:43pm · Edited · Like · 1



Michael Swenson <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/.../110923-neutrinos.../>



Particles Moved Faster Than Speed of Light?

news.nationalgeographic.com

A claim that neutrinos traveled faster than light would be revolutionary if true, but "I would bet against it," physicist says.

March 22 at 4:59pm · Like · Remove Preview



Michael Swenson http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/.../most_common_logical... this theory of saying because there is energy within all mass (true observation); that it makes mass and energy equal (false conclusion) is a prime example of an argument/theory that overtly is violating laws of epistemology and logic.

The Most Common Logical Fallacies


www.webpages.uidaho.edu

Ad Hominem This translates as "to the man" and refers to any attacks on the perso... [See More](#)

March 22 at 5:12pm · Like · 1 · Remove Preview



Michael Swenson https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded...



Secret Military Space Mirrors

Are miniaturized versions of the world's largest ionospheric heater (HAARP) all ...[See More](#)

March 23 at 5:27pm · Like · Remove Preview