

Rejection of Professor Tolga Yarman's Paper by the Canadian Journal of Physics

Stephen Crothers

Dr. Michael Steinitz
Editor in Chief, Canadian Journal of Physics,
Dear Sir,

I write to you in protest at the rejection of Professor Tolga Yarman's paper by the Canadian Journal of Physics. Your rejection of Professor Yarman's paper is unscientific and stifles legitimate scientific discussion so that only the current mystic dogmas maintained by the majority of astrophysical scientists is now promoted in most journals, thereby deceiving the scientific community, science students, and the general public at large. I also note that your Associate Editor who allegedly read the paper has not reported to Professor Yarman any alleged errors in his paper nor indicated why his paper "does not meet" some or all of the criteria you have listed. This amounts to a disingenuous rejection of Professor Yarman's paper.

It is astounding that demonstrable nonsense dealing with things such as black holes, wormholes, white holes, Big Bang cosmology, expansion and accelerated expansion of the Universe, Big Crunch, Einstein gravitational waves, dark matter, dark energy, dark forces, quintessence, the Higgs boson, string theory, multiverses, parallel universes, General Relativity, and more besides, are given unbridled publication rights whereas any paper, such as Professor Yarman's paper, that calls into question any of these fantasies, is summarily rejected in order to protect and perpetuate the mysticism, superstition and science-fiction that currently characterises theoretical physics, and particularly astrophysics and astronomy.

Scientific truth is sacrificed for the preservation of jobs, project funding, and reputations made on the foregoing claptrap and demonstrates the state of intellectual decrepitude into which contemporary theoretical physics has descended. Besides appearing in the major journals the same foregoing nonsense is reported daily on webpages whereas nothing refuting these falsehoods is reported on those same webpages. This is a form of gross censorship that must not be allowed to continue if science is to progress by its rightful means.

In support of Professor Yarman's paper I attach two recently published papers:

'Proof of no "Black Hole" Binary in Nova Scorpii'
'General Relativity – A Theory in Crisis'

You will note that these two simple and concise papers underwent double blind peer review. You will also note that in both papers the following paper is cited:

Abrams, L. S. "Black Holes: The Legacy of Hilbert's Error", Can. J. Phys. 67: 919 (1989),
<http://arXiv:grqc/0102055>

It is evident that the Editorial Board of the Canadian Journal of Physics is no longer unbiased and

scientific as it was in 1989. For the many scientists privy to this email who might not be able to access the attachments, drafts of the two foregoing published papers and the as yet to be published paper ‘On the Alleged “Black Hole” Binary in Nova Scorpii’ can be obtained as follows:

‘On the Alleged “Black Hole” Binary in Nova Scorpii’ <http://vixra.org/pdf/1206.0081v1.pdf>
‘Proof of no “Black Hole” Binary in Nova Scorpii’ <http://vixra.org/pdf/1206.0080v1.pdf>

‘General Relativity – A Theory in Crisis’ <http://vixra.org/pdf/1207.0018v1.pdf>

You can be assured that there is a large and growing international community of true scientists who are fed up with the way in which science is currently censored and misrepresented and that these scientists are now organizing themselves into a formidable force to take on the peddlers of the current false mystic dogmas that pose as science and that mesmerize all and sundry with the fervour of theological zeal.

Finally, by way of yet another typical example of scientific malfeasance, I draw your attention to a webpage report on the 18th July 2012 falsely claiming a black hole in the bright quasar 3C 279. Here is correspondence to the scientists involved:

Douglas Pierce-Price,
Jonathan Weintraub,
Lucy Ziurys,
Michael Lindqvist,
Shep Doeleman,
Thomas Krichbaum,
Alan Roy

Dear Scientists,

I refer to the online report ‘APEX takes part in sharpest observation ever’ 18-Jul-2012, (http://www.eurekalert.org/pub_releases/2012-07/e-atp071612.php) in which your names and email contacts are specifically mentioned.

You report that there is a supermassive black hole in the bright quasar 3C 279 and that “The Event Horizon Telescope will be able to image the shadow of the supermassive black hole in the centre of our Milky Way galaxy, as well as others in nearby galaxies.” I draw your attention to the following simple facts which prove that there cannot be a black hole in quasar 3C 279, at Sgt A*, or at the centres of any galaxies, contrary to the assertions in the aforementioned report.

I first remark that all alleged ‘black hole solutions’ to Einstein’s field equations pertain to a universe that contains only one mass, namely, the mass of the alleged black hole itself. There are no known solutions to the field equations for two or more masses and there is no existence theorem by which it can even be asserted that the field equations contain latent solutions for two or more masses. So all black hole ‘solutions’ cannot model the Universe at all because the actual Universe obviously contains more than one mass. According to the Dictionary of Geophysics, Astrophysics, and Astronomy [1]:

“Black holes were first discovered as purely mathematical solutions of Einstein’s field equations. This solution, the Schwarzschild black hole, is a nonlinear solution of the Einstein equations of General Relativity. It contains no matter, and exists forever in an asymptotically flat space-time.”

Note that the black hole is a General Relativistic object. Now in General Relativity the Principle of Superposition does not apply, which means that one cannot simply pile up masses at will, black holes of otherwise, in any given spacetime to get more masses as one pleases because the field equations must be solved separately for each and every configuration of matter proposed, in terms of an appropriate energy-momentum tensor that describes the proposed configuration of matter. In other words if A and B are separate solutions to Einstein's field equations the linear combination $aA + bB$, where a and b are scalars, is not the overall gravitational field due to A and B separately. However, in Newton's theory the Principle of Superposition does apply. Concerning the fact that the Principle of Superposition does not apply in General Relativity, Landau and Lifshitz, for instance, remark [2]:

“In a gravitational field, the distribution and motion of the matter producing it cannot at all be assigned arbitrarily --- on the contrary it must be determined (by solving the field equations for given initial conditions) simultaneously with the field produced by the same matter.”

So, upon what energy-momentum tensor do you rely for the alleged black hole in quasar 3C 279 and hence upon what solution to Einstein's field equations do you rely for its presence? There is in fact no known set of field equations for the black hole alleged in quasar 3C 279, or for that matter any black hole at the centre of any galaxy. Moreover, owing to the foregoing one cannot, by an analogy with Newton's gravitational theory with its valid Principle of Superposition, assert that the black hole can exist in multitudes, merge or collide or otherwise interact with one another or other matter, be located at the centres of galaxies, suck in surrounding matter, that a black hole can be a component of a binary system, or that a black hole 'solution' can model the actual Universe in any way whatsoever.

By an inadvertent blending of two different and incompatible theories, by means of an inappropriate application of the Principle of Superposition, you have produced for the alleged black hole in quasar 3C 279 a Newtonian universe containing a non-Newtonian entity (a black hole), which is impossible; or conversely, a Relativistic universe that contains additional masses besides that of the black hole, which is also impossible, as explained above.

Interestingly, it has been alleged by Schmidt et al. that there is a black hole binary system in Nova Scorpii [3]. This claim is also fallacious for the very same reasons that there cannot be a black hole in quasar 3C 279, at Sgt A*, at the centres of any galaxies or in the actual Universe. I refer you to the following two short papers which explain in more and easy to follow detail why this is so:

“On the Alleged “Black Hole” Binary in Nova Scorpii’ <http://vixra.org/pdf/1206.0081v1.pdf>
“Proof of no “Black Hole” Binary in Nova Scorpii <http://vixra.org/pdf/1206.0080v1.pdf>

The first paper contains no mathematics at all and the second paper a little mathematics that does not go beyond senior high school calculus, and so both papers are quite easy to follow, and are well referenced. The straightforward arguments presented in these two papers also pertain directly to the fallacy of alleged black holes in quasar 3C 279, Sgt A*, all other galaxies, and hence in the actual Universe.

Yours sincerely,
Stephen J. Crothers

REFERENCES

[1] Richard A. Matzner, Ed., Dictionary of Geophysics, Astrophysics, and Astronomy (CRC Press LLC, Boca Raton, LA, 2001).

[2] L. Landau & E. Lifshitz, The Classical Theory of Fields (Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, MA, 1951).

[3] B. Schmidt et al, "Formation of the Black Hole in Nova Scorpii", The Astrophysical Journal, 567: 491-502 (1 Mar 2002).

On 7/30/12, Tolga Yarman <tolgayarman@gmail.com> wrote:

I am so sorry to read this...

If capable people like ourselves, despite so very many concrete findings and rigorous derivations, find themselves in a such an unfair obstruction, this should really constitute a massacre to the healthy development of our humanity's understanding of matter and universe. I simply warn you, thus without requesting anything from you, any more...

You know, I also understand why you are doing this, and you will understand, what I understand...

In any case you better realize that "science is not a religion, nor is it a club of - one way or the other - ultrabiased people"...

**

I am sorry, if you will find this letter, here or there (perhaps at the end of the book I will make out of the outstanding article (about Revealing the Mystery of the Principle of Relativity, and making a whole new unification of micro and macro worlds), I had presented to your journal for publication.

Your problem is not with this article, and the way I perceive, cannot be (for, I firmly believe, there is no single mistake in there, you can point to). Your problem yet, is with what the approach, I have presented, kills, and with the whole new horizon of conception it offers.

Nevertheless, now I feel, we have to fight with the utterly unscientific and non-ethical attitude you deliberately delineate, with means you will well understand. You may not know it, but you opened a horrible wound the Journal of Canadian Physics; it will bleed out, for long...

**

All the best...

Tolga Yarman, Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Nuclear Science & Engineering, 1972,
Professor, Okan University, Istanbul, Turkey

30.07.2012 15:08 tarihinde, cjp@nrcresearchpress.com yazdı:
30-Jul-2012

Dear Prof.Dr. Yarman:

We have received the paper described above, which was read by one of our Associate Editors. I regret to inform you that our Associate Editor feels that the manuscript is not appropriate for publication in the Canadian Journal of Physics as it does not meet one or more of the following criteria:

- 1.) Originality and significance of the research reported. Research Articles should contain a substantial amount of significant new material in physics.
- 2.) Correctness of the research.
- 3.) Relation to existing knowledge.
- 4.) Motivation.
- 5.) Clarity of expression.

Please note that the Canadian Journal of Physics is an international, refereed, primary research journal which only publishes articles representing significant contributions to physics.

I wish you success in your future endeavours.

Sincerely,
Dr. Michael Steinitz
Editor in Chief, Canadian Journal of Physics

Specific Comments:

Associate Editor/rédacteur en chef adjoint
Comments to the Author:
(There are no comments.)