The Forbidden Equation $i = qc$

by Miles Mathis

First published October 19, 2022

A reader wished me to comment briefly on Forrest Bishop's "forbidden equation" *i=qc*, where *i* is current, *q* is charge, and *c* is the velocity of light. I agreed to do so since it ties into my charge field, allowing me to show once again how that solves both mainstream and alternative problems in physics. Bishop has created a lot of needless mystery here, the greatest mystery to me being why he never addresses my solution to his problem. He prefers to address solutions to his problem that don't work, like that of Palmer, which I guess is understandable. Like the mainstream, he just pretends I don't exist, or don't count. I don't count in either case because I mess up all their promotion.

Bishop says the equation is forbidden because it shows that charge is traveling at the speed of light, which means it must be massless. He says the mainstream has hidden the equation because they prefer to assume whatever is causing current and voltage is not moving at c and has mass. They do this because they have explained electricity as the motion of ions, especially electrons, hence the name. So far so good, since I (mostly) agree with him on that. The mainstream is definitely dodging this question, along with all other questions to do with charge. He then points out the problem of the ground wire, which I have also addressed here. He makes some of the points I do there, but then says no one can explain where the negative charge comes from on the lower wire. Although I do just that.

But his entire paper on the forbidden equation falls apart right here, in his conversation with Ivor Catt:

IC: ...Do you, Forrest, think that the mere statement i = qc refutes classical theory, showing us that since charge gained mass in around 1900, classical theory was no longer fit for purpose?
FB: Yes, i = qc means that q has to be massless because c is the only speed at which this equation can hold...

That's really the whole crux of his argument, but it just isn't true. The conclusion that *q* has to be massless because it is going c is based on Einstein's relativity equations, part of which include the "proof" that mass goes to infinity at c, so the photon must be massless. I have destroyed that proof, showing it was attained by pushing series math in hamhanded ways, and jettisoning all post-Newtonian formalisms. That proof was always an outlier of Relativity as a whole, and nothing about the transforms relies on it. I was able to rewrite Relativity, keeping the transforms (with subtle corrections), and confirming a large part of Einstein's results. But one of my important corrections to the foundational math proved that Einstein's limit math was flawed, and that there was no series of that sort, and therefore no limit of mass at c.

In subsequent work I was able to show that a particle doesn't gain mass from speed alone in accelerator, it gains mass from the charge field it is moving through, via spin-ups. By skipping steps, ignoring theory, and a compensation of errors, Einstein was able to get near the correct equations for mass increase, but because his math and method was far too compressed and far too sloppy, he wasn't able to see the role of charge in his field equations. Einstein understand that himself and said so: it is why he was working on unification the last four decades of his life. By unification, he meant he was trying to

figure out how EM fit into his equations. Or to say it another way, how CHARGE fit into his equations. He never solved this because he didn't understand how charge had been buried by Maxwell and Bohr, by conflating it with electricity. Maxwell never understood what his D field was mechanically, though I have shown it is the charge field as a real photon field; and Bohr also conflated the mass of the electron with the mass of the photon, fudging between them in foundational equations and crippling his field for decades with his sloppy variable assignments.

But just for the sake of clarity, let me gloss the series mistake Einstein made. In that link above to my paper pulling apart Einstein's first paper line-by-line, you will see that I caught him reducing an equation wrongly:

Einstein's final error is a simple mathematical one. He assumes that

$$c^2/(c^2 - v^2) = 1/\sqrt{(1 - v^2/c^2)}$$

When in fact it is simply

$$1/(1 - v^2/c^2)$$
There is no square root!

I wasn't the first one who caught him at that. Born also pointed out that square root drops out of nowhere in the derivation. But for some reason Born was ignored and the error was buried. Once Einstein imported the tensor calculus, the original derivation became invisible. Did he correct it? No, he just ignored it, along with all the other errors.* These errors aren't so obvious once you import matrices and all that mess. Anyway, once you lose that square root you lose the ability to expand that term *gamma* using a Taylor series. But this is where the limit at c comes from. Einstein expanded *gamma* using infinite series, then applied terms in the series to nature, with the first term being the Newtonian field. The other terms became the parameterized post-Newtonian field, which gave newer mathematicians yet another playground to go wild in. But since none of that was legitimate from the first word, it was all another pipe-dream. It was *gamma* that gave Einstein the infinite series in the mass increase equation as well, as you can see here. In the first section you can see how he imported *gamma* unanalyzed from Special Relativity into the mass transforms. In later sections I show that the mass transforms of Relativity reduce directly into the Newtonian $E = \frac{1}{2} mv^2$, with no approximation and no expansion. This also dooms all parameterized post-Newtonian formulisms, but more importantly dooms the limit at c. All that math has to be thrown out as compromised by previous errors.

What this means is that there is absolutely nothing to prevent the photon from having mass. Which means that Bishop's forbidden equation doesn't imply what he says it does. Yes, it does imply the photon is the quantum of charge, not the electron, and that charge moves at c. But it does not imply that charge is therefore massless.

I have even used constants like G and k to calculate the mass of the charge photon, which turns out to be on the order of 10^{-37}kg. Conveniently that matches mainstream math, which has been used to put the photon below 10^{-36}kg.

Perhaps even more interesting is that I have used that mass of the photon to extrapolate up for a mass of the entire charge field, showing that the mainstream already had longstanding equations indicating not only that it had appreciable weight, but exactly what that weight was (as a fraction of the whole). It is

95% of the universal field, which just happens to be mass of dark matter. Yes, dark matter is just charge.

So why is Bishop selling his confusion? Because, like Ivor Catt, the Thunderbolts, and many others, he is selling the idea that photons do not exist. Very strange, since we have tons of evidence they do, going all the way back to the photo-electric effect of 1905. Bishop is pushing TEMs, or transverse electromagnetic waves with a waveguide, which he describes thusly:

The TEM wave is a shock-wave slab of energy-current, obstructed or otherwise--a half-cycle square wave in the time domain. This replaces the sinusoidal photon of occasional properties.

Not very appealing, is it, especially to my readers who have seen what I have done with the photon. A "slab of energy-current"? That is just ignoring the physical definition of words, isn't it, since "energy" and "current" are descriptors. Something has to *have* energy, and something has to *create* current. You can have a current of water, but you can't have a current of nothings. In the same way, a thing can have energy, but a nothing cannot. So what has this energy and current? A wave, he will say. But again, a wave of what? A wave is also a descriptor. It is a characteristic of a field of things. A wave cannot exist on its own, any more than a spin can. Both beg the question: what is waving, what is spinning? I answer these questions, but he doesn't. A real spinning photon of real radius can create a spin wave just by moving. It isn't even a field wave, it is a spin wave, and can be carried by one photon.

Bishop's need for a wave-guide is also very ugly, <u>but I have commented on that extensively here</u> in response to Eric Reiter's Unquantum Theory. Bishop and Reiter seem to be selling the same poisoned kool-aid. My photons do not need wave-guides, since they create them.

I can also answer Bishop's claim that Catt's two-page paper from 1978 is the most important paper of the 20th century on EM:

We begin with the most important electromagnetics paper of the 20th Century, all *two pages of it*: "This is the historic first disclosure, in December, 1978, of research findings by Catt, Davidson and Walton."

"The flaw in this model [Theory N -FB] is revealed when we notice that the electric current entered the capacitor at one point only on the capacitor plate. We must then explain how the electric charge flowing down the wire suddenly distributes itself uniformly across the whole capacitor plate. We know that this cannot happen since the charge cannot flow out across the plate at a velocity in excess of the velocity of light." -Catt, Davidson, Walton, 1978

We have seen similar claims made by the mainstream in many areas, including entanglement and teleportation, in which things appear to be happening faster than c, though upon closer inspection they are not. <u>The most obvious case of this is quantum teleportation</u>, which we just hit again two weeks ago when the Noble Prize went to that subject. They think information must be teleported because it seems to travel faster than light.   But I showed this was due once again to their misunderstanding of the charge field, both what it is made of and how it works. This is what I said in that paper from 2014:

They will say that some experiments indicate a speed of information faster than light, which tends to disprove my interpretation and prove entanglement. But that is another mistake. The apparent infinite speed of transmission is easy to explain in my theory, since it just means the

information was already transmitted *before* they measured it. In other words, they think the transmission of information begins when they throw some switch or perform some action, but it had already happened before that, unknown to them. Since the information is already at point b before they start measuring, of course it is going to appear to be infinitely fast. This confusion is again caused by their misunderstanding of the charge field. They don't think the charge field is there until they apply some current or other E/M field. But the charge field is always there, even in vacuum. All particles are communicating via this charge at all times, and always have been. There is an ambient charge field everywhere in the universe. They can't turn the charge on the proton or electron on or off, can they? No, and they admit that. Applying current or a magnetic field doesn't turn on or off the charge on the proton and electron, it only uses that charge, giving it direction or density. So there is no way to "turn it on." And no way to turn it off. But if you can't turn it off, you can't measure its speed because you can't precede it. It will already have happened before you measure it. Logically, you would have to create a charged particle from particles not previously charged—in order to turn on the charge. And then you would have to measure the new charge as it left the particle, which means you would have to create and measure at or above the speed of light. I am not aware of any machines we have like that. Otherwise, you cannot differentiate old charge from new charge, or old photons in the field from new ones. When they claim these photons that are mediating entanglement are not mediating the information, they only mean the photons they are tracking. But since there is an infinite line of photons moving between all the bodies, their claim is meaningless. Charge pre-exists their "preparing the teleporter through entanglement", so they have no proof or indication that information is teleporting. What they have proof of is photon transportation, which is a very different thing. Photons are just carrying information across the gap, with no mystery involved.

It is the same thing in Catt's experiment. Like the mainstream, these no-photon guys don't understand what the charge field is or how it works. Beyond the problems we have already looked at, they also don't understand how charge is channeled by matter. Like their mainstream enemies, they aren't aware of how the nucleus channels charge and how that creates EM. And like their mainstream enemies, they seem incapable of reading my pretty straightforward papers and enlightening themselves to the nuclear architecture and all the other things I have discovered. To me, both sides seem wilfully and perversely ignorant.   Since my papers have been superviral for years, they would have to claim senility or dementia not to have heard of them.

For that reason, I tend to dismiss these guys in the same way I now dismiss the Thunderbolts: as witting controllers of the opposition, creating confusion on purpose.   Remember, I outed the Thunderbolts years ago as a probable Intelligence operation, since I proved they arose from the cubicles of spook Alfred de Grazia, Commanding Officer of the Psychological Warfare Propaganda Team. I am not making that up, it is on his posted bio at Wikipedia. So someone in the government would prefer you think that photons do not exist. Why? I can only speculate, but it appears they would like to classify the existence of photons, along with everything else that is true. They want you stupid, needy, and confused, because then you won't question any of their billion-dollar projects.

*Actually, other derivations were concocted by Einstein and others to get the square root by other means, but I have shown they are all equally compromised by the same initial errors, especially errors of variable assignment and field parameters.