

Two Potentially Life-Saving Discoveries Prove A Big Burden

Otto E. Rossler

Faculty of Mathematics and Science,
University of Tübingen,
Auf der Morgenstelle 8,
72076 Tübingen, Germany
E-mail: oross00@yahoo.com

Accepted on December 24, 2015

Abstract: Two “big things” discovered recently in physics are highlighted. Since both begin with the letter *c*, they can be called “the 2 *c*’s” (cryodynamics, *c*-global). One is a whole new science; the other is a return to the early Einstein. Both can be life-saving since a currently running experiment proves unsafe in their wake. The problem is communication with the experimenters. (December 8, 2015)

Keywords: *c*-global, cryodynamics, big progress, early Einstein, unification, necessary renewal of LSAG, CERN

Introduction

Cryodynamics (literally “dynamics of coldness”) is the recently discovered sister discipline to 150 years old thermodynamics (literally “dynamics of heat”). The naming is not optimal because thermodynamics applies to gases made up from mutually *repulsive* particles while cryodynamics actually applies to gases made up from mutually *attractive* particles (like a gas of moving galaxies interacting with passing photons). Whereas thermodynamics leads to equipartition of the kinetic energies of the involved particles, cryodynamics leads to anti-equipartition because its time’s arrow points the other way [1].

Cryodynamics explains the cosmological redshift law of Hubble *without* space expansion: photons traversing the cosmos lose energy to the randomly moving galaxies in proportion to the distance traveled (Zwicky’s ridiculed idea of 1929 confirmed). Therefore the “Big Bang” becomes a thing of the past after a reign of 88 years. More importantly than changing cosmology, cryodynamics offers a method to interactively cool a growing local instability in the plasma of a fusion reactor like ITER (by the concentric injection of hotter electrons). This paradoxical option if true gives cryodynamics a vital role to play in the world’s energy supply of the future [2].

***c*-global** comes no less unexpected. It consists in a return to the “younger” Einstein of less than 32 years of age who still stuck to the speed of light in the vacuum (*c*) being a *global* constant of nature. Immediately thereafter, *c* got reluctantly degraded to remaining only an everywhere *locally* valid constant [3]. As to the most recent proof of *c*-

global, see [4]. To best visualize the difference between the traditional view and the retrieved global *c*, the famous *Shapiro time delay* offers itself: Light grazing the sun on the way to a distant orbiting satellite takes *longer* than in the absence of the sun along the path [5]. With *c*-global in charge, the grazing light ray now travels along a so much longer *spatial* path too, so that the famous “Einstein funnel” is a little bit deeper now. Near a black hole, the funnel has become infinitely deep – so as to match the infinite Shapiro time delay valid in that case.

c-global independently of cryodynamics puts an end to cosmic expansion. This follows because two sufficiently distant parts of the cosmos can now no longer recede from each other at superluminal speed (as the expansion postulate requires). The Big-Bang thus gets disproved for a second, entirely different reason. Note that like any other purely observational science, cosmology suffers a *regiornamento* from time to time in the wake of the Copernican revolution.

Consequences

Taken together, cryodynamics and *c*-global offer young scientists free reign to both re-invent *cosmology* and advance *fusion technology*: a “double bonanza.”

But in addition, there exists a **third** consequence of *c*-global now which for once is appalling: A currently running mega experiment has become **unsafe**. This is because in light of *c*-global, the properties of **black holes** are no longer the same as previously believed. Therefore, the most anticipated sweet fruit of the *Large Hadron Collider* nuclear experiment at CERN – the **production of miniature black holes** on earth – has become bitter. The decisive new feature of black holes in light of *c*-global is **absence of Hawking radiation**. Therefore, the most anticipated experimental success of history can, if accomplished, no longer be detected by CERN’s sensors. On the other hand, any *miniature black holes* formed can from now on only grow exponentially inside matter – much as their giant cousins in the cores of galaxies do in the presence of eatable stuff.

This new situation [6,7] goes undisputed in the scientific literature for 7 years but is very hard to make known to

the public. This is because the media burned their face once by reporting all over the globe about the experiment's unsafe status at the time of its start in September of 2008. At that time, the intriguing potential danger only meant added free publicity for the CERN experiment. However, when a young girl in India committed suicide in response to the planetary danger reported, the media resolved to never again report on the LHC in a critical fashion. The well-deserved Nobel Prize for the Higgs seemed to confirm the strategy.

Discussion

The planet therefore has a **big decision** to make to date: Shall we embrace the lure of *cryodynamics* with its promise of unlimited climate-neutral energy for planet earth despite its being at variance with the Big Bang? Or shall we rather consciously neglect *c*-global and its ally, cryodynamics, in order to let the "Big Bang experiment" go-on on earth? For transposing the experiment onto the moon for safety reasons will cause a major delay apart from the costs. Conversely by neglecting *c*-global, the LHC experiment can continue even without renewing its **8-years-old safety report LSAG**, one feels.

c-global is the spoilsport since it totally upsets the properties of black holes. The latter cannot even be registered by CERN's detectors any more due to the new lack of Hawking radiation, but grow exponentially inside matter now. In case CERN does succeed with its greatest aim, one of the little fruits is going to eat earth inside out after a symptom-free interval of exponential growth of several years. The odds for success lie fortunately "only" in the low-percentage range at present wisdom.

Shall the planet start discussing the new properties of black holes? This should be avoided for psychological reasons. However, the "two c's" do require a re-appraisal of the LHC experiment. Does a reader see a way how to transport the need for clarification in a more tactful way? Ideally, CERN should renew its outdated safety report LSAG *immediately* (if they still can in the wake of the 2 c's).

To conclude, I apologize that I published two fundamental results in physics which fly in the face of a decades-long consensus, *c*-global and cryodynamics. Such a revolution is rare in history so you should not blame CERN for their silent incredulity. In their place, you probably would also

only have ears for Hawking's loud silence. But maybe, one or two of my readers will find it not below their dignity to listen to a 75 years old male who still personally met the best friends of Einstein. Einstein himself would have loved the "2 c's" and embraced the rare occasion to save the world (old men have more female hormones). Before the content of this note reaches the greater public, CERN has a brief chance left to counter the "unsafety argument of the two little c's" – so the children of planet earth are spared unjustified fear.

Acknowledgment

I thank Frank Kuske for a discussion. For J.O.R.

References

1. Rossler, O.E. (2011), The new science of cryodynamics and its connection to cosmology. *Complex Systems* **20**, 105–113.
2. Rossler, O.E., A. Sanayei and I. Zelinka (2013), Is hot fusion made feasible by the discovery of cryodynamics? *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing, Springer*, Vol. **192**, pp. 1-4.
3. Einstein, A. (1911), On the influence of gravity on the propagation of light (in German). *Annalen der Physik* **35**, 890–898.
4. Rossler, O.E. (2015), The *c*-global revival in physics. *Progress in Physics* **11**, 340-343.
5. Shapiro, I.I. (1964), Fourth test of general relativity. *Physical Review Letters* **13**, 789–791.
6. Rossler, O.E. (2008a), Abraham solution to Schwarzschild metric implies that CERN miniblack holes pose a planetary risk. In: *Vernetzte Wissenschaften – Crosslinks in Natural and Social Sciences* (P.J. Plath and E.C. Hass, eds.), Berlin: Logos Verlag (July 2008), pp. 263–270 (submitted September 27, 2007). <http://www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/ottoroesslerminiblackhole.pdf>
7. Rossler, O.E. (2008b), A rational and moral and spiritual dilemma. In: *Personal and Spiritual Development in the World of Cultural Diversity* (G.E. Lasker and K. Hiwaki, eds.), Vol. **5**, Tecumseh: The International Institute for Advanced Studies in Systems Research and Cybernetics (July 2008), pp. 61–66 (submitted May 20, 2008). <http://www.wissensnavigator.com/documents/spiritualottoeroessler.pdf>