Elastic and Inelastic Collisions?

by Miles Mathis

First published April 14, 2025

This paper came to me while falling asleep last night, not sure why. Planted by the Muses of physics, as usual, I guess. They know I am a good listener.

But before we get to elasticity, I want to link you to an old paper that hasn't gotten the attention it deserves. It ties in here, as you will see. Even I don't promote it much, since most times when promoting I have to concentrate on the half dozen biggest things I have done, and this may not qualify. It concerns explaining the tilt of the Earth and its eccentricity (how out-of-round or oval its orbit around the Sun is). It has the same sort of mathematical beauty my Gauss papers have, since I am able to go from one set of numbers to another almost instantly, which should elicit gasps.

I remind you that the current numbers for tilt and eccentricity aren't thought be connected, and that is because we are told both are accidental. We are told the Earth is tilted at 23 degrees because it was hit by a very large asteroid early in its history. They admit that isn't a very good theory, since we have zero evidence for it. We have found the craters of the other big hits, like Vredefort or Chicxulub, so the crater from an asteroid capable of knocking the whole Earth over should be pretty obvious, right? Well, they would prefer you not ask that question, because no such crater exists. In fact, an impact like that would have had to have been at a high latitude, and it would have lopsided the entire Earth. So the theory is a non-starter, like most mainstream theories.

I showed we don't need silly theories like that once we recognize the Solar System exists in a powerful charge field. The Earth is in the charge field of the Sun and the Sun is in the charge field of the Galaxy. So we aren't in a gravity-only universe. Using the same mechanism I later used to explain the Solar Cycles, I showed that the Sun is emitting a huge charge field of real photons, one that goes out to the planets, is recycled through them, and then returns to the Sun. The Earth is caught in between the Sun and the four big planets, so it gets charge from both directions. Given that, all you have to do is compare the charge density going out to the charge density going in, and you can calculate the tilt in a few lines of math. In short, the Earth is tilted to maximize its charge intake, leaning over to get as much as it can from the Sun *and* the Jovians.

After that, we only need one more line of math to find the eccentricity:

I will once again limit my math to the four big planets, simply estimating an answer. In my Axial Tilt paper I showed—using simple unified field equations—that the four planets were responsible for a tilt+inclination of the Earth of 33.66°, which, being 37.4% of 90, indicates a 37.4% difference between the planets' effect and the Sun's. Since the planets are an average of 23 times further away from the Earth than the Sun, we divide .374 by 23 to obtain .0163. That would be the eccentricity just from the four planets and the Sun. Since the actual eccentricity of the Earth is .0167, I am very close already.

That one paragraph should have caused sirens to go off in universities all over the world, but as usual the silence was deafening. Every single physicist and astronomer in the world had to pretend his eyes had just failed and that he was no longer able to read human language. That was the biggest finding in science since Newton, but I haven't heard a single comment on it, good or bad, in over 14 years. And that is just one of hundreds of things I have done, and it isn't even in the top ten. I am promoting it again now because I think it is one of the easiest to comprehend, even for those who don't know much about physics or astronomy.

We all learned a bit about elastic and inelastic collisions in our opening physics and chemistry courses, but not much more in later courses, since nothing much is known. You need to assume collisions are elastic for much of the math of physics and chemistry, but they never get around to telling you whether real collisions are elastic, or to what extent. Or what causes elasticity. Why would some collisions be more or less elastic than others?

Well, my theory of charge tells us. That is because I have proved all particles have REAL spin and they are recycling and emitting real charge, which is photons. Even photons themselves have REAL spin and real spin energy, though they are not recycling photons. But electrons are. That is why and how electrons are charged. That is what charge is. Real photons moving through spherical particles on defined paths, mostly pole to equator.

You can see how that explains elasticity, because it gives each particle a very high spin on its outer border, which is a real energy. It is that energy that cannot be penetrated, not some rigid wall.

So anytime we are looking at quantum collisions, we are looking at particles with very high spin velocities, with v(tangent) being c or near c. Not only that, but with particles bigger than photons, we are looking at not only the particles themselves, but their emitted charge fields. In fact, most of the energy of the particle will be in its emitted charge field, so we have to remember that at all times. 95% of the energy in any given field will be charge energy, since charge "outweighs" matter by that much in most cases.

But we have a further complexity, because you have to track not only the spin, but the DIRECTION of the spin. I have proved we not only have real charge, we have real anticharge, which is just charge where the photons have an opposite spin. This anticharge doesn't just arise in strange circumstances, it is always there. Every nucleus is recycling both charge and anticharge, one through one pole and one through the other. Many of the electrons in a normal nucleus are actually positrons, so they are recycling anticharge. They will either continue to do so outside the nucleus, or they will be flipped, or they will be spun down by external charge.

Which shows us that in normal elastic collisions, we are seeing or calculating collisions between particles with the same spin. If they are in a gas, for example, they are in the same ambient charge field, and so will be roughly spin matched (except for particles that have flipped). These will be molecules, so they will be spinning at less than c, so they are able to spin one another up. They basically trade positive spins. But in other situations, particles can spin one another down. This is caused by opposing spins, so anticharge will always be present in these cases.

Current theory takes none of this into account, because it doesn't have a real charge field to work with. It sometimes makes use of up/down states, but it doesn't assign these states to real spin or a real charge field of photons being recycled through quanta. This is why their mechanics fails and they have to resort to virtual fields and fudged operators.

For instance, here is what they tell us at Wikipedia:

The *molecules*—as distinct from atoms—of a gas or liquid rarely experience perfectly elastic collisions because kinetic energy is exchanged between the molecules' translational motion and their internal degrees of freedom with each collision. At any instant, half the collisions are, to a varying extent, *inelastic collisions* (the pair possesses less kinetic energy in their translational motions after the collision than before), and half could be described as "super-elastic" (possessing *more* kinetic energy after the collision than before). Averaged across the entire sample, molecular collisions can be regarded as essentially elastic as long as Planck's law forbids energy from being carried away by black-body photons.

As you now understand, that is wrong. The inelasticity isn't a result of internal degrees of freedom, it is a result of spin mechanics and unequal fields. Molecules normally are made of several nuclei, so they aren't homogeneous. One part of the molecule will have a stronger charge field than another part. So it depends on where the hit takes place. Beyond that, molecules are moving more slowly and spinning more slowly, as I just said and as is known, and since they are spinning below c, they can absorb spin energy without stacking on another spin. That's the main reason the collision would appear inelastic in regard to linear or translational motion. The total energy of the particle is a sum of linear and spin energy, so you can't just track linear energy and claim that kinetic energy isn't conserved.

When a collision is highly elastic, it is normally because we are dealing with homogeneous particles with outer spins at or near c, so they can't absorb any more spin energy without stacking on another spin.

But I draw your attention once more to the way the mainstream goes out of its way to avoid talking about spin. Never any spin mechanics (which they have replaced with a virtual and fudged wave mechanics); and in the rare occasion the question of spin is broached, they rush to tell you it isn't a real spin, as about an axis. It is a virtual spin, or a phenomenological spin, or a goofological angular momentum or something. Why do they do that? Because they are horrible at visualizing anything and get lost immediately whenever they try to track spins in complex situations. To avoid doing any real mechanics—which requires visualizations and often drawings—they decided long ago to follow Bohr and Heisenberg into fudged operators, where they can do anything they wish without anyone noticing. That has been the story of the past century.