

[return to updates](#)

STEPHEN HAWKING SIGNALS THE END OF MODERN PHYSICS

He admits there is no Black Hole

by Miles Mathis

First published January 27, 2014

On January 22, his magnificence Stephen Hawking posted a paper on ArXiv to answer the current firewall paradox of the black hole. Immediately, [all the mainstream sources](#) published a report on this paper, telling us the gist of it: “There are no black holes.” That was in the title at *Nature*, so don't try to tell me I am pushing this interpretation to suit myself.

Although this paper is important as a bellwether in the collapse of Modern Physics, as a piece of science it is . . . well, not one. As I showed [in a recent paper](#), this whole firewall paradox was manufactured out of nothing, simply in order to allow mainstream physicists to continue to avoid real questions. Although the past five years have provided incredible new data in all subfields of physics that should be more than enough to keep top theorists busy, they have preferred to continue to hide out in black holes, in the first three seconds of the universe, in dark matter, and in virtual-land. For instance, we now know [Mercury has icecaps](#), the Saturn moon [Enceladus is reflecting at nine times over unity](#), that [Uranus has an upper](#) atmosphere at 1,100°F, and that [common table salt doesn't obey](#) the fundamental rules of chemistry. Experiments are showing all of modern physics and chemistry breaking down before our eyes, and yet we see top theorists continue to camp out in la-la land. When they aren't issuing denials, they are misdirecting us back into their manufactured controversies, as we see here. As Nature becomes less and less amenable to their old theories and equations, they dig their virtual foxholes deeper and deeper.

We see that immediately in Hawking's abstract, where he begins,

It has been suggested [1] that the resolution of the information paradox for evaporating black holes is that the holes are surrounded by firewalls, bolts of outgoing radiation that would destroy any infalling observer. Such firewalls would break the CPT invariance of quantum gravity and seem to be ruled out on other grounds.

Already we are in the twilight zone, since that is just a mishmash of no-data assumptions. One, we have no data indicating black holes “evaporate.” It is just a what-if: “*what if* black holes evaporated—what would happen?” Two, we have no indication of firewalls. A firewall is just another proposal, based on nothing but very old math. It is a computer model based on quantum assumptions, but we have no indication those assumptions are true and strong indication they aren't true. For example, we see Hawking saying there that firewalls would break CPT invariance of quantum gravity. What is CPT invariance? It is an old theory of Schwinger from 1951 concerning charge, parity and time symmetry. Soon after that, Luders and Pauli (and Bell) derived the symmetries mathematically. Unfortunately, this was never anything but busy work, and they soon found that out when all the proposed symmetries were broken in real experiments. Beta decay and kaon decay break parity, and everyone knows that. There is also no CP parity, and they also admit that. And although they sometimes claim time reversal

to fudge their explanations, they also have no indication time takes part in any kind of symmetry or reverses. It is just a raw claim. Therefore, CPT symmetry is just a bad guess, and should have been tossed out decades ago. I don't understand why Hawking or anyone else still mentions it.

If you think that claim is rash, consider this admission we find at Wikipedia:

These proofs [of CPT] are based on the validity of Lorentz invariance and the principle of locality in the interaction of quantum fields.

But wait, haven't the top theoretical physicists been telling us for decades that quantum mechanics is non-local? Shouldn't this affect the proofs of CPT, which require locality? And don't the Lorentz violations now stack to the Moon? Each one is a disproof of Lorentz invariance. Doesn't anyone require consistency anymore?

This all goes to say that these new controversies like the firewall controversy are simply manufactured. They are not paradoxes that come from real data, they are paradoxes that come from the incongruity of several old bad maths. In the black hole, the bad math of quantum mechanics meets the bad math of the gravity field, and these fake paradoxes are created that way.

Hawking and most of the reporters admit that, in their own ways. Hawking talks about the CPT of quantum gravity. But they have no good theory of quantum gravity. All attempts at unification ([except mine](#)) have failed spectacularly, and they have no unified field equations that even begin to match a broad range of data. "The correct treatment," Hawking says, "remains a mystery."

It remains a mystery to those who only accept mainstream physics. For my readers, it is no longer a mystery.

Beyond that, the gravity field equations alone fail, as do the quantum field equations. I have shown in dozens of papers that both sets of equations are fatally flawed at the ground level, and have been from the start. They also admit that, although in quiet tones. They have admitted a 4% error in General Relativity many times, including in the Pioneer anomaly, [the Saturn anomaly](#), and many other motion-specific Lorentz violations. The existence of so many Lorentz violations is an admission of failure itself, since correct equations would not be violated all the time. That is the definition of correct, or used to be. In quantum mechanics, the failures are even more extensive and more obvious. Every reversion into virtual theory is an admission of failure, since good equations should work on real particles. We see that in this very problem, which is linked to beta decay through the CPT discussion we just had. To explain beta decay, they have to borrow from the vacuum, break symmetry, and do many other embarrassing things to create a theory. [I have solved the problem](#) with simple spin mechanics, showing that the local field was never symmetrical to begin with. Spin symmetry is only global, not local, so the whole problem was manufactured from a false assumption. They *assumed* CPT symmetry, based on a hunch, then "proved" it with pushed math. But if you *don't* assume it, beta decay is easy to explain with straightforward mechanics and real particles. They *assumed* these symmetries were the logical outcome of energy conservation, but I have shown why they aren't.

I have also shown the [Bohr equations are pushed](#), the [Schrodinger equation is fudged](#) and pushed and misinterpreted, the [Lagrangian is misdefined and pushed](#), and so on. Is it any wonder that these bad equations lead them into paradoxes? Is it any wonder they can't be unified with gravity?

But back to Hawking's paper. This is sentence three:

If the black hole evaporated completely without leaving a remnant, as most people believe and would be required by CPT, one would have a transition from an initial pure state to a mixed final state and a loss of unitarity.

I have shown that what is required by CPT has nothing to do with it. CPT is broken all the time, so why mention it here? The same could be said of “what most people believe.” *What most people believe* isn't a piece of data that needs a physical response or theory. As we know, most people believe huge numbers of things that aren't true, and their beliefs are based on few or no facts. Therefore, one should read Hawking's “argument” not as an example of science, but as a matter of brainwashing. Scientists don't talk about what most people believe, because they don't give a damn what most people believe. Science addresses data, not beliefs. Only propagandists talk to you about what most people believe.

Hawking is also brainwashing you with all this talk of ADS-CFT correspondence. That correspondence is just a *conjectured* relationship between conformal field theories and anti-de Sitter spaces. Since ADS are string theory beasts used in quantum gravity, they are hypothetical in the extreme. To say it even more clearly, this proposed correspondence between ADS and CFT is just a correspondence between two manufactured *maths*. It has nothing to do with physics, and just as with CPT, has actually been refuted by experiment. All CFT's rely on assumptions of invariance, *invariance that does not exist*. We saw that beta decay refuted old assumptions of parity. Well, loads of new and old experiments refute the assumptions of CFT's, but they don't let that stop them. In modern physics, the math comes first and then they try to rig the data to the math afterwards. If it doesn't fit, they just beat it into place by replacing all real particles with virtual ones, replacing all real fields with virtual ones, and borrowing from the vacuum to fill any remaining holes. For this reason alone, you shouldn't care a whit for any ADS-CFT correspondence. It doesn't *matter* if their manufactured maths correspond, since all their maths are both dreamed-up and wrong. Once you understand that, you understand that Hawking is only talking about ADS-CFT to misdirect you, and to sell you again on string theory—which he tied his horse to many years ago.

In the same way, we have no indication that a black hole, even if it existed in some form, should have a “pure” initial state and a “mixed” final state. These adjectives *pure* and *mixed* depend on entanglement of particles, and this idea of entanglement is itself false. The idea of entanglement didn't come directly from the wavefunction, the Bohr equations, or the Schrodinger equation; rather, it came from the desperate attempt to explain certain experiments that came later. But [since I have shown](#) these experiments can be explained mechanically with simple real spin assignments, entanglement was never needed. And that means that this argument about entangled particles on the edge of a black hole was another tempest in a teapot. If there is no entanglement, there is no pure state, no mixed state, and no paradox, either inside the black hole or anywhere else. Once again, Hawking is just misdirecting you into a manufactured controversy, in order to keep your mind off the fact that modern physics is disintegrating. If he can keep you reading and arguing about event horizons, you will never get around to asking him about [the Higgs fakery](#), the [Brave New World propaganda](#), the [Fundamental Physics Prize mystery](#), the [vacuum catastrophe](#), the [neutrino muddle](#), the icecaps on Mercury, the burning atmosphere of Uranus, the missing mass, [the failure of gamma](#), the [upside-down Rayleigh equation](#), the [winds on Venus](#), the [partial wavefunction](#), the [Moon's ionosphere](#), and a thousand other more interesting and more physical topics.

To see another way he is misdirecting you, let us study his fourth paragraph, which describes his second objection to the firewall. He says that

calculations of the regularized energy momentum tensor of matter fields are regular on the extended Schwarzschild background in the Hartle-Hawking state [3, 4]. The outgoing radiating Unruh state differs from the Hartle-Hawking state in that it has no incoming radiation at infinity. To get the energy momentum tensor in the Unruh state one therefore has to subtract the energy momentum tensor of the ingoing radiation from the energy momentum in the Hartle-Hawking state. The energy momentum tensor of the ingoing radiation is singular on the past horizon but is regular on the future horizon. Thus the energy momentum tensor is regular on the horizon in the Unruh state.

Let me tell you what that means: *not a goddamn thing*. [Stephen Crothers](#) has shown that all this Schwarzschild math has been manufactured, and that it isn't even manufactured from Schwarzschild's own equations. The original equations of Einstein, Schwarzschild, and others were purposely bastardized by Hilbert and many others after him precisely in order to allow them to set up permanent camp in the black hole, theorizing wildly in the presence of no data, and misdirecting you away from realizing that all their equations were garbage from the foundations. I myself have extended Crothers' argument by [analyzing the Einstein and Friedmann field equations](#) from the first postulates, showing that the energy momentum tensor was achieved only through a series of hamhanded mathematical cheats at the ground level. But even if that weren't true, Hawking's later cheats would nullify this entire paragraph and all of his theories since he was in college. Notice for example that Hawking admits he has radiation coming in from infinity. That is physically impossible. You can't write an equation for that radiation at infinity, since there is no way to insert an infinite distance into a mathematical equation. And even if you did, as distance goes to infinity, energy would have to go to zero. "Incoming radiation at infinity" has no physical meaning. Even supposing radiation could come in from infinity (it can't), it would take infinite time to arrive, which means it would arrive too late to take part in any given real event described by any given real equation. In physics, time and distance are functions of one another, remember? Every distance implies a time. So if Hawking *has* found a way to include radiation from infinity, he has cheated: it is that simple. Therefore, all the rest of his claims are also just a bluff. He manufactures a number for the Hawking energy, subtracts the Unruh energy from it, and tells you this somehow implies a difference between the past horizon and the future horizon. But since his first number is manufactured, all his later numbers and assignments are also manufactured.

The rest of the short paper follows this same fake procedure. To manufacture the semblance of an argument, Hawking assumes a host of things for which we have no proof and lots of disproof. As another example, he assumes in the next paragraph that "Non-linearities in the coupled matter and gravitational field equations will lead to the formation of a black hole." Note that: you don't even need great mass to create a black hole. According to these guys, all you need is non-linearities in the coupled matter and field equations. But of course "coupling" is an outcome of entanglement, [which I have already disproved](#). The death of entanglement leads to the necessary death of this kind of black hole creation, since it deprives the quantum gravity guys from pushing the field equations with fake coupling. They love entanglement because it gives them these pushes, whereby they can move energy over infinite distances without having to obey any of the old rules of kinematics or dynamics. As with borrowing from the vacuum or virtual particles, entanglement is a sort of infinite fudge. With it, you can do absolutely anything. As more proof of that, notice how Hawking finishes this paragraph:

If the mass of the asymptotically anti-deSitter space is above the Hawking-Page mass [7], a black hole with radiation will be the most common configuration. If the space is below that mass the most likely configuration is pure radiation.

So these "physicists" can create areas of pure radiation from nothing but non-linearities in the field. Energy comes straight out of the math, in other words. New physics is not *procreatio ex nihilo*, it is

procreatio ex mathematica.

By page three, Hawking really begins to unwind, since we find him saying this:

This shows that, in this situation, the evaporation of a black hole is the time reverse of its formation (modulo CP), though the conventional descriptions are very different. Thus if one assumes quantum gravity is CPT invariant, one rules out remnants, event horizons, and firewalls.

What? The evaporation of a black hole is the time reverse of its formation? Nothing else we know of works like that, so why would a black hole work like that? Astronomical black holes are theorized to be a species of large star, and what star reverses the first part of its life in its second? What galaxy does? What planet does? What rock does? What molecule does? Hawking is trying to conform the entire life of the black hole to manufactured CPT assumptions, but why not conform all matter to CPT assumptions? I'll tell you why: because all matter except black holes is *known* not to conform to CPT assumptions in that way. Time always moves forward, and the second half of a life is never simply the reversal of the first half. That is true at all levels of size. Hawking's second sentence there tells us why: because we don't (or shouldn't) assume the unified field is CPT invariant. In fact, we *know* it isn't. The real field conserves energy, but it doesn't conserve parity, doesn't fill gauges, doesn't allow for entanglement or tunneling, and doesn't conform itself to every wild conjecture of every famous theorist. Before Hawking assumes that quantum gravity is CPT invariant, he might first consider defining quantum gravity. To discover the attributes of any given thing, you must first have a sample of that thing. But he admits we have no working sample of quantum gravity. For the mainstream, quantum gravity is just two words pushed together and a lot of mathematical finesses. You cannot logically assume that two words pushed together are invariant in any way. It would be somewhat like assuming alien gods have two legs. Since we have no clear idea of what either aliens or gods are, any assumptions about what they are together are premature.

Another problem is that Hawking's new theory completely overturns all his old theory, though he doesn't seem to be aware of it. Even if we interpret this new paper as only a change of math, and not a complete ditching of the black hole, what he says here contradicts what he said before. This whole manufactured controversy was created by Hawking decades ago, when he postulated that information could be lost in a black hole. This violated “unitarity,” of course. But now, by conforming everything to CPT, the evaporation must be the inverse of formation, which must give us both unitarity and the return of all information. Anything that went in must come out.

Even worse is that the CPT assumption also destroys the event horizon, and *he admits that*. This is what has thrown everyone into a tizzy. The event horizon has been the defining characteristic of the black hole for many decades. So why would Hawking throw away his entire life's work only to keep the CPT—which everyone knows is false?

Others are saying Hawking is suffering from Alzheimer's or something, but that isn't my interpretation. As I have said, these top theorists like Hawking have been manufacturing controversy for almost a century as misdirection, and I read this paper as simply more misdirection. They had already mucked up this black hole math to such an extent 50 years ago that no one could ever unwind it, and have continued to stir it since. *They contradict themselves on purpose*. They want you so confused that you eventually just accept whatever you are told. They don't want to solve these problems, they want them as permanent open questions, to lure all the armchair physicists, philosophers, and psychologists, who can debate the finer points and keep the magazines and journals properly inflated. You see, this black hole debate is a species of *divertissement*, akin to the old “angels dancing on the head of a pin” debate.

It is also related to the open-ended wars we are now sold, through which the Pentagon can justify its bloated existence. It is related to the medical research, which never cures anything, but only sets up a permanent regimen of expensive healthcare and subsidized vaccines. Science is no longer science, it is anti-science dressing itself in the garb of science in order to obtain maximum funding. Like art and all other modern things, it is the polar opposite of that which it claims to be. Its function is financial. Its function is not to solve problems, but to entrench them.

There may well be large dark stars, but this black hole math has only prevented us from understanding what they are and how they formed. Using my unified field, I have shown my readers [a far more likely reading of dark stars](#). To obtain any sensible theory of dark stars, you have to understand the role of the charge field in unification, and since the mainstream has never had that, it was on the wrong path from the beginning. We see that simply from the name they have chosen: quantum gravity. They think gravity needs to be unified with quantum math. No, gravity needs to be unified with the charge field, since the charge field is the second fundamental field. The “quantum field” isn't even a field, it is just a description of size. It only tells us we are very small, but it gives us no field. Math by itself doesn't give you a field. To obtain a field, you have to have to *assign* the math to something real, and quantum physicists have never done that. They have no idea how quantum forces are relayed, and they are about a century past caring. *They don't even have a theory*. Or, they have a theory of virtual messenger photons that “tell” larger particles what to do and then disappear. That is just magic, and doesn't count as a physical theory.

I was only able to create a unified field by assigning quantum math to a field of real particles. Why hasn't the mainstream done that? Because if you make their messenger photons real, you foul up their gauge math. They are in love with their maths and will not give them up for any reason. They would honestly rather have a huge pile of incommensurate maths than have a unified field. Having a unified field would force them to clean up their rooms and throw out a lot of their beloved toys, and they will not countenance that idea. These maths are huge and impressive (to the shallow and credulous), and they have made a lot of people wealthy and famous. These physicists would rather have wealth and fame than have a working unified field, and so that is what they have. It isn't that hard to understand, is it? Probably *you* would rather have wealth and fame than a working UFT. Or, since you are reader of mine, maybe I should give you more credit. Let me put it is this way: we can tell by the arc of science since 1900 that most working physicists prefer a paycheck to good science, since if they didn't, we wouldn't be where we are.

Addendum, February 28, 2014: *National Geographic* decided to cobble together a quick propaganda piece on the Black Hole and lead with it on their cover in March. Curious timing, wouldn't you say? Clearly, they don't want to lose this primary piece of misdirection. It has been both their richest cash cow and their most successful physics diversion for many decades. The idea of the Black Hole has prevented more real physics than any idea in history. You may also wish to ask yourself what Black Holes have to do with Geography. Why are we being hit over the head with particle physics and string theory agitprop on the cover of the premier geography magazine? This is just more proof that *National Geographic* has been taken over by the propaganda machine. If it ever had any real independence, it lost it long ago. It is now just one more tentacle of the squid, one more cog in the Matrix.

