

## Questions to the Scientists in Physics

If you look around in physics and try to understand what many physicists say about it, you easily come to the conclusion that they are not on good terms with logic. Many statements show that there are major deficits in knowledge, some statements are incomprehensible and contradict their self-proclaimed status of having understood and mastered the basics of physics. I will now following pose a series of questions showing today's standard opinions contradicting the facts. Most of these questions cannot be answered sensibly. Some of them show pseudo-scientific declamations of natural processes being in the opinions considered as official today. It shows some physicists either negate the scientifically proven basic knowledge or recite it as if it were memorized sayings and then reject it again, means have not understood it at all.

### The questions:

- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the law of conservation of energy, but then explain energy came into being from nothing 13.8 billion years ago? (If it came into being, it is not a conservation quantity).
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the mass-energy equivalence ( $E=m \cdot c^2$ ), but then explain there is "pure" energy having no mass? ( $E$  is always 0 when  $m = 0$ , because  $c$  is a natural constant). Einstein said: "Mass is the measure of the energy content of a body".
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the mass-energy equivalence, but then explain mass is matter but energy is not? (Energy is a form of matter that is equivalent to its mass).
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the laws of conservation of mass and energy, but then explain mass can be converted into energy and vice versa and even claim that the equation  $E=m \cdot c^2$  proves this possibility? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/MasseEnergieFehler1.htm>, [http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Masse\\_in\\_Energie.pdf](http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Masse_in_Energie.pdf), <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/MasseEnergieUmwandlung.pdf>)
- What do physicists mean when they say to have understood that mass and energy are conservation quantities, meaning they exist eternally, but then explain the matter of the universe came into being 13.8 billion years ago from nothing, so it had a beginning and is therefore not eternal? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/WasIstLos.htm>)
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood that mass and energy are conservation quantities, i.e. they exist eternally, but then explain mass can disappear in particle processes? (Mass defect, see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/PhysikPhilosophie.pdf>)
- What do physicists mean by saying mass and energy are of course conserved quantities that exist eternally, but then shatter the logic by adding, "but only after they have come into being"? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/WissenSerioes.htm>)
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the theory of relativity, but then publicly announce that neutrinos move at a speed greater than the speed of light? (CERN, 2011, see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/NeuesCERN.htm>)

- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the theory of relativity, but then explain you can travel faster than the speed of light in the universe with so called solitons (with a WARP drive)? (see also [http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Groesser\\_C.pdf](http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Groesser_C.pdf))
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the theory of relativity, but then explain that space is expanding at several times the speed of light and “taking matter with it”? (Inflation phase, see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/WissenschaftNichtZuRetten.pdf>, <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/BewegungMaterie.htm>)
- What do physicists mean by saying matter is everything that has mass and takes up space, but then explain that mass is a property of matter, which would mean mass is a property of mass? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/WesenMaterie.pdf>)
- What do physicists mean by saying there are spaces with more than three dimensions? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/PhysikPhilosophie.pdf>)
- What do physicists mean by saying gravity is not matter, but then look for gravitational waves that spread in space? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Gravitationswellen.htm>, [http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Gravitationswellen\\_Maerchen.pdf](http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Gravitationswellen_Maerchen.pdf))
- What do physicists mean by saying space can be curved and time too? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Raumkruemmung.pdf>)
- What do physicists mean by saying to have understood the nature of matter, but then treat space, time and forces like material objects that can move? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/Materiedefinition.htm>)
- What do physicists mean when ignore laws of nature (such as the Lambert-Beer absorption law for radiation in the cosmos) and when invent speculations (such as dark energy) with the only aim of being able to maintain the Big Bang hypothesis? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/LambertBeer.pdf> <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/HeiseDunkleEnergie.pdf>)
- What do physicists mean when they hold on to the Big Bang hypothesis, even is missing though 70% of the energy required for the expansion model of the universe that logically follows the Big Bang? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/FaelschungenFehlschluesse.pdf>)
- What do scientists mean when they say that it is possible to prove that the sum of all natural numbers from 0 to infinity is equal to  $-1/12$  and explain that this is the required way to calculate in the string theory? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/DieSummenUnendlicherFolgen.pdf>)
- What do scientists mean by saying science and religion are not mutually exclusive, they are just two different methods to explain the world? (see also <http://hauptplatz.unipohl.de/Wissenschaft/NeuesCERN.htm>)

I am convinced all of these questions, to which there is no meaningful answer, characterize the deep crisis in which science of physics has been stuck for several

decades. James Clerk Maxwell and later Max Planck pointed to this crisis. If we want to overcome this crisis, we need to abolish illogical, mystical, metaphysical and religious thought structures in physical science and return to a dialectical-materialistic view to the object of research in physics, the matter. The crisis cannot be overcome by maintaining the current mainstream views.

With these views, considerable social resources will continue to be spent on research projects from which no results can be expected even in the basic approach. Examples include the search for gravitational waves and the research into dark energy.

It is important to give a public voice to the many critically thinking physicists who have recognized the fundamental errors in the mainstream theories and not to continue to suppress them. Restoring logic-based ways of looking at things is a basic prerequisite for overcoming the crisis.

One can only express surprise that all these strange errors are widely printed in the scientific press as serious contributions, while the critical opinions of serious scientists fall victim to ideologically misguided reviewers by virtue of their decision-making powers.

One cannot blame physicists who have taken their studies seriously if they perceive some of the views declared to be official opinion today as cabaret interludes, because some of them are amusing and cannot be meaningfully explained by any rational way of thinking. I think the questions posed above show this very clearly.