


THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY IS ABSOLUTELY WRONG

THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY IS ABSOLUTELY WRONG



Emil Gigov
10.18.2011

INTRODUCTION

In the Nature exist countless facts, whereas only thing backing relativity is the hypothesis, that the speed of light is invariant universal constant. However this hypothesis is meaningless, because it is clear that there exist superluminal velocities and absolute quantities. In this case, the Theory of relativity is arbitrary and wrong. This has been mentioned by many true scientists, such as Rutherford, Soddy, Michelson, Sagnac, Lenard, Larmor, McMillan, Tesla, Tsiolkovsky and others, unlike the modern physics. As regards so-called relativistic proofs, they are mostly imaginary and hidden. For example, black holes are hidden under a layer of luminous atmosphere, gravitational lens is hidden in the atmospheric lens, gravitational redshift of a star is hidden in the Compton effect, mass of an electron is hidden in the mass of the beam, Lorentz contraction is hidden in stellar aberrational contraction etc. Also, the relativistic navigational system GPS, actually works in accordance with classical physics, because there is a privileged coordinate system, as well as disturbances in data, which are being corrected permanently by ground control stations.

The Theory of relativity can be described briefly as follows: Michelson's experiment does not register the movement of Earth; space is empty; speed of light is invariant universal constant; flying vertical light-clock runs slower; flying horizontal light-clock is contracted; acceleration is gravity; everything is relative and depends on speed; teleportation exists. However this means that everything is chaos, but in Nature there is no chaos, nor yet teleportation, besides not everything is relative. Moreover, Michelson's experiment is just one special case, whereas in the general case the speed of light is variable, for example in interferometer of Sagnac. It is unacceptable for a special case to be treated as a general case, because there exists many other special cases, i.e. the presence of a square doesn't prove that everything is square.

Instead of facts, Theory of relativity is build of subjective contradicting hypotheses. Besides, Einstein equalizes different things and exchanges them arbitrarily, which brings chaos in the physics. Thus, an apple could become pear, because they are both fruit, however this is absurd. The apple is absolute, not relative and it is impossible to express an apple by means of pear. Mathematics allows such nonsense operations, but the real physics consists of facts and can be described without mathematics. The errors in a theory become visible even without complicated experiments, when the facts are being separated from the hypotheses and mathematics.

ERRORS IN THE THEORY OF SPECIAL RELATIVITY (TSR)

The main hypothesis in TSR is, that the speed of light in empty space is invariant universal constant. But in reality, Sagnac's light-gyroscope clearly proves, that the velocity of light is variable. Furthermore, the speed of photons in

one ray is variable with respect to lateral observer. Also, LHC proved the presence of superluminal speed. Besides, in vacuum, Sagnac's interferometer managed to ascertain the absolute rotation of the Earth, whereas the Michelson's interferometer did not find it, this can be explained only by the classical emission theory of light. Consequently, the speed of light is variable.

According to TSR, space and time are relative, what means that there are no absolute phenomena, and there are countless different evolutionary lines for a given phenomenon, i.e. chaos. But in the Nature, there are absolute phenomena, such as electricity, magnetic field, annihilation, chemical reactions etc. Moreover, each system has only one evolutionary line, i.e. there is no chaos in Nature.

It is known, that the optical effects of Doppler and Bradley are relative optical illusions, what are dependent on the speed. But according to TSR many optical illusions are reality, thus there is no difference between the optics and mechanics, so is being got relativistic mechanics. This approach however is wrong, because the mechanics is absolute and do not depend on the optics, as mechanics exists even in the absence of light or observers. Furthermore, observation is also possible through sound or jets of particles etc., for what the speed of light is not important. The speed of light is important for the optics, but not for the mechanics. Lorentz transformations are hypothetical optical illusion, because they are additional aberration to stellar aberration. For that matter, the Earth appears optically in relative peace to us, but mechanically, it rotates absolutely, what is proven by a gyroscope. Also, the absolute time in the mechanical system can be given through a solid long rotating shaft; this time is independent and different from the optical. Consequently the true mechanics is absolute, while optics is relative.

Special principle of relativity, does not distinguish between rest and inertial motion, however in the Faraday's law of electromagnetic induction, there is absolute difference between rest and movement of conductor in a magnetic field. In this law the motion is absolute, and the faster is moving a straight wire through a magnetic field, the greater electrical voltage is generated. As the space has magnetic fields, therefore we can distinguish between rest and movement with respect to them. Moreover, it is possible to make linear inductive motor, which can moves through space controllable.

Time paradox is quite absurd. According to it, if two clocks fly to one another, each of them lags behind the other, i.e. the two times will be double differential asynchronous. But in practice, such a dual delay is impossible and does not exist. For example, it is quite clear, that if the two clocks were synchronized before starting the translational relative motion, they will remain synchronous also after stopping this relative motion, irrespective of the observers. This is because, after all, there is no way in practice, each of the clocks to show less value than the other. In other words, the registered differential time lastly is zero, because it can not have two different values simultaneously. On the whole, the time paradox clearly disproves TSR.

Paradox of lengths is also ridiculous. For instance, from the perspective of a fast rocket, it can not pass through an inclined hole, which is Lorentz-contracted. But from the perspective of the hole, the rocket is Lorentz-contracted and can pass. Consequently, the rocket will pass and will not pass, simultaneously. It is clear, that this is impossible.

Relativistic Doppler effect is asymmetrical and uncompensated, since the blue is larger than the red. This is related to the appearance of the relativistic transverse red Doppler effect, better known as dilation of time. But this

asymmetry contradicts to the law of conservation of energy, as well as to the effect of Fizeau.

In the relativistic law for velocity addition, it appears that an object has two different speeds simultaneously, towards one final observer, i.e. there is a paradox of speeds. The reason for this is, that there are two independent consecutive observers and a single object. Object itself can be a light beam. The first observer is an intermediary between the object and the second observer. The first one is independent of the TSR, because he can measure directly the relative velocity between the object and the second one, even if that speed is superluminal. The second observer is final, he calculate indirectly its relative speed to the object, using data obtained from the first observer, but apply to them Lorentz's transformations and so obtains different value. Thus it turns out, that the second observer has two different speeds simultaneously, toward the object. Moreover, the classical law for the velocity addition has been proven experimentally by the first observer, which disproves the relativistic law. Consequently, the speed of light is variable, and is not equivalent to infinitely large velocity.

In TSR there is no Lorentz's transformation for the electrostatic charges of the particles. So the charges remain classical, absolute and constant, which is not typical for this theory. If the charges be transformed and become variable, then the masses of the particles would be completely different in the mass spectrometer. Consequently, in TSR there's a conflict between the mass and the charge.

Hypothesis for relativistic mass, leads to countless different evolutionary lines in a given system, but in reality there is only one evolutionary line. Furthermore, hypothetical relativistic mass increases exponentially due to the relative speed, however, that cannot be true in the general case. For example, according to the law of conservation of mass, the total mass in a closed system is a constant. Consequently, if a lateral observer, watching acceleration between two attracting opposite charges, their masses will not increase due to the speed toward him. Moreover, during the mutual acceleration of these opposite charges, their potential energy is converted into kinetic, under the law of conservation of energy, therefore the charges decreased, i.e. they are not constant. In other words, the charges are variable and neutralize each other. Such reduced and accelerated charges, leads to erroneous reading of the mass in the mass spectrometer, creating illusion that the mass is increased. There is also another reason for the occurrence of such an illusion. During big relative velocities, the interaction between the fields weakens, so fast particles turn much less in the external field. By and large, the formula for the relative mass is untenable and the real mechanical mass is absolute.

As the mass is absolute and the speed of light is variable, then the formula for the relative energy is wrong. Thus it is wrong also the quantum mechanics, because this formula is fundamental there. A formula like $E = m.c^2$ occurs by Newton too, but his is valid only for absolute waves in elastic environment, not for bodies.

Four-dimensional space-time is a combination of two Lorentz's transformations, but since they are untenable, it also is wrong and is always equal to zero. Space-time represents a nullified equation, composed from the difference between two equal quantities, namely: light-time and light-track of a light ray. Besides, the track is calculated with the theorem of Pythagoras. This yields something like differential sync-phase luminous clock, which always shows zero. Moreover, space-time violates the principle of causality, because the time is converted to space. With the same success we can convert the space into time.

So it is not clear, how exactly the systems evolve, i.e. there is chaos. Furthermore, space-time leads to the hypothesis of expansion of the Universe, because the radius of the spherical light wave always growing, so the space is finite and expands. But in reality, the events are located inside the large space, rather than define it. Only the classical concept of space and time is actually proven. By and large, the time is not a space, and there is no chaos or teleportation in Nature.

When an observer measures the relative speed between two independent lateral objects, he may find even superluminal speed for them. For example, if an observer broadcast in opposite directions two objects moving at the speed of light with respect to him, then he will calculate that the relative velocity between objects is equal to twice light-speed. This result is a classical fact.

According to Einstein, the visual simultaneity of two optical phenomena is relative and depends on the speed of the observer, because light from the approaching event outstrips that of receding event. But from this follows, that light can travel equal distance with different speeds, i.e. its speed is variable, so the optical simultaneity is illusion.

In Maxwell's electrodynamics exists ether, so the speed of light is variable. Exactly this had attempted to measure Michelson with his interferometer. This means, that the original Maxwell's electrodynamics does not contain invariant constant speed of light, since this speed is incompatible with the ether. Actually, today's classical electrodynamics is not the original one.

As we know, dispersion prism decomposes light, because different photons have different speeds inside. But achromatic prism do not decomposes light, consequently the total refraction angle of a photon inside, does not depend on the speed of light. In other words, this prism acts as a mirror. This means, that we can not determine the speed of a falling ray through the achromatic prism. Hence, Arago's experiment for measurement of the light-speed through achromatic prism is meaningless. This stultifies the conclusion that the speed of light is constant. Moreover, astronomers have shown that pulsars emit electromagnetic waves with different speeds, as dopplerian blue waves arrive more quickly than red ones. Also, at advent of supernova stars, visible light arrives slightly faster than gamma rays. These facts support the emission theory of light.

In TSR all quantities and phenomena are symmetrical, such as space, time, motion, Doppler effect etc. But in Nature there are asymmetric phenomena, such as stellar aberration. In this phenomenon the movement of the observer is absolute, because the aberration does not depend on the individual relative speeds toward distant stars. As we know, the aberration is an optical illusion that distorts the universal coordinate system toward the geocentric coordinate system, thus the coordinates displace themselves in proportion to the relative distances and the divergence achieves very large values. At the same time, because of the perspective, all distant stars appear as statical. So the relative motion of distant stars toward Earth, practically does not influence on the aberration, because it is much less than the visual displacement of the coordinates. All distant stars that look statical, i.e. don't have parallax, they possess equal transverse aberration from Earth, regardless of their relative velocities toward us. Precisely in this it consists the asymmetry, because if a distant observer is at rest toward the Universe, he sees no aberration, but at the same time he has aberration for earthly observer, although the relative inertial velocity between these two observers is the same in both cases. Therefore, these two inertial systems are not equal, which contradicts TSR.

Many phenomena, such as stellar aberration, Hubble effect, gravitational lenses, gravitational redshift and others, can be easily explained through the cosmic atmosphere, without relativistic hypothesis. Cosmic space is not empty, it has a variety of fields and nebulae. The tenuous space atmosphere is clearly visible around the celestial bodies and galaxies, as well as a diversity of nebulae. Moreover, the artificial satellites around the Earth, move themselves in spiral orbits and fall, because the space is not empty. Also, the Earth's rotation decreases slightly. The rare space environment influences manifestly on the cosmic optics, as refracts and colors light rays, furthermore slowly and smoothly drags photons and equalize their speeds toward itself, because of the Fizeau effect. By this reason, over long distances is valid wave theory of light, whereas over short distances, i.e. in vacuum, it is valid emission theory of light. Consequently, the photons have dualistic nature and transform themselves from waves into something like corpuscles, when pass from substance to vacuum. This means that stellar aberration is a complex phenomenon in the almost empty space and the speed of light is variable. Of course, besides the atmosphere, fields also are important.

ERRORS IN THE THEORY OF GENERAL RELATIVITY (TGR)

According to TGR, everything is relative. But as is known, in Nature exist absolute things, such as the chemical properties of substances. Consequently, TGR is absolutely wrong.

In TGR there is gravity, but no electrostatic fields, magnetic fields and quantum effects. However, not everything in Nature is gravity, for example, the hypothetical dark matter becomes unnecessary, if we consider the presence of electrical fields in the galactic plasma.

As we know, around every big celestial body there is atmospheric refraction lens, which bends the electromagnetic waves. These lenses have dispersion, for that reason the radio waves are bend more than light rays. This is easily seen in both the Earth's atmosphere and the big Sun's atmospheric wind. Really astronomers have registered significant refraction of radio waves passing near the Sun, but negligible refraction of light rays there. This absence of optical lens demonstrates dispersion and refutes the hypothesis of gravitational lensing, contrary to TGR. According to this theory, gravitational lens is like atmospheric one and has a focal line instead of a focal point, but don't has dispersion and is considerably larger than the atmospheric lens. However, observations show that all cosmic lenses have dispersion, i.e. they are atmospheric lenses, which possess weak dispersion unlike dense substances. Many galaxies bend radio waves, but not x-rays. As astronomers have found, that just over the surface of the Sun is missing refraction of light rays, for that reason don't exists a true contemporary picture of Sun's gravitational lens for light. Only a picture of radio wave refraction exists from there. On the whole, the so-called gravitational lenses, actually are atmospheric lenses and Sun is the best proof of this, i.e. the light is not attracted by gravity. This fact is confirmed by the so-called black holes, because in reality they are white and very shiny. Moreover, the observations of stars orbiting around the center of our Galaxy, don't display gravitational lensing.

Toward geocentric coordinate system, the Universe rotates with superluminal peripheral speed, contrary to TGR. To avoid appearance of this superluminal speed, the Universe must twist itself backwards around the Earth like turbulence, but nothing such happens actually, i.e. this relative peripheral speed really is superluminal.

In TGR all phenomena are asymmetrical, but this conflicts to TSR and to the relativism at all, because the asymmetrical phenomena are absolute, such as rotation, gravitational fields, star aberration etc.

TGR cannot be used for navigation, because it leads to chaos, as according to this theory there is only rest at navigation. For this reason, at navigation always is used classical physics, including in systems as GPS. Navigation is impossible without classical privileged coordinate system.

Main hypothesis of TGR is that both acceleration and rotation are gravity. However, all types of gyroscopes prove, that rotation of a given system is absolute, i.e. spinning is not gravity. This refutes both principle of equivalence and general principle of relativity. Furthermore, the light gyroscope of Sagnac disproves also the principle for constant light-speed. The relativists reject absolute rotation, but they use it in practice. This can be seen in the hypothesis for Born coordinates, Kerr metric, frame-dragging, geodetic effect and many others. Gravity has no tangential direction unlike rotation, so if we swap them randomly, then will not exist neither Sagnac effect nor frame-dragging. This contradiction shows, that the absolute rotation is irreplaceable and is a proven fact, which clearly confutes TGR. On the whole, this theory has no logical explanation, why actually the gyroscopes works.

The principle of equivalence is completely refutable by many manners. According to this principle, inertness is weight, weightlessness is free fall, and the uniform acceleration is homogeneous gravity. In reality, nobody has proven, that there exists homogeneous gravitational field. Such a field can never exist, as can not exists straight arc. Such a hypothetical field could be created only by infinitely distant mass, but this contradicts the expansion theory, where the Universe is finite. Moreover, such a field does not have significance, because it is extremely weak and can not create any forces of weight. Almost homogeneous gravitational field exists between two big masses, but the small bodies there don't have weight. The principle of equivalence is not correct also for rotating systems, because each rotation is absolute, what is demonstrated very easy by gyroscope. Light also refutes this principle, as don't attracts by the gravitational field, for instance the so-called black holes emit light. In other words, the light reacts solely to mechanical acceleration, not to gravitational. Equivalence principle is not yet true for open systems with an external observer, as well as for heavy celestial bodies with variable gravitational acceleration.

Attempt of Einstein to prove the equivalence principle, consists in the following. In empty space there is a uniformly accelerating box, in which there is an independent free falling inertial observer. When from the ceiling of the box is emitted light to the floor, the observer will ascertain that it arises blue Doppler effect toward the floor. Consequently, time of the ceiling is accelerated in comparison with time of the floor, hence the speed of light at the ceiling is increased. Then Einstein concluded, that since the light has mass, it attracts with gravitational fields, consequently there exists gravitational lenses, gravitational redshift, black holes etc. However, these conclusions are wrong for many reasons. For example, if the speed of light decreases downwards, then falling bodies can have superluminal speeds. Furthermore, because of the acceleration of the box, a horizontal ray of light will bends downward and the light will accelerates toward the floor, instead of decelerates. It turns out, that according to Einstein, the light simultaneously slows down and speeds up to the floor, which is impossible. Also, the falling inertial observer sees, that the velocity of the dropping light is increasing to the floor and became superluminal. Another considerable error is the asynchronous chaotic time, which arises because Einstein applies consecutive Lorentz transformation of time, firstly to the ceiling and then to the floor of the box, instead of simultaneous transformation. The

consecutive Lorentz transformation is absurd, because it changes only some regions of a given coordinate system, not the whole of it. In empty space there can be only simultaneous Lorentz transformation, changing the entire coordinate system. Thus, the speed of time at the ceiling is always equal to the speed of time at the floor, because the ceiling and the floor always have equal velocities toward the inertial coordinate system of the observer. Consequently, the time in the box is synchronous everywhere, i.e. it is locally absolute time, and the Doppler effect inside appears to be an optical illusion. The presence of synchronous mechanical time in the box, can be proved easily through a vertical rotating shaft, this is a common mechanical clock. So if we lift up a clock and then return it below, it will not be desynchronized at all, no matter how long it stood up and how it appeared optically from there. Also, the navigational system GPS does not prove anything for the velocity of time above, because contains noises, which are constantly being corrected from the ground. Slight redshift of some stars, can be explained through Compton effect, Doppler effect etc. As for so-called time-tunnels in black holes, there are no such because these bodies shine strongly and burn the substance without to teleport it. Moreover, in the imaginary homogeneous gravitational field, there is no physical reason for variable velocities of light and time, i.e. they must be constant and synchronous there. In addition, acceleration is not gravity, as the acceleration can be created and changed arbitrary unlike gravity.

Equivalence principle also is not true towards the Universe, where is located given accelerating platform. For example, accelerating observer, sees increasing stellar aberration, while an observer standing in the gravitational field, sees unchangeable stellar aberration, because gravity is not acceleration. Besides, there is no kinematic reason for the existence of gravitational lenses in the outer inertial world, especially in independent lateral inertial system, consisting of a light source and observer. This is explained in the following manner. In the principle of equivalence, mechanical acceleration and gravity are the same thing, thus, free fall and inertial rest are also the same thing. Furthermore, it is known, that if an inertial observer is at rest relative to the celestial sphere, he sees zero stellar aberration. This aberration is always zero for this observer, irrespective of whether somewhere one arbitrary platform is accelerating or not. In other words, any arbitrary foreign acceleration, does not create additional stellar aberration for this observer. Consequently, any arbitrary foreign gravitational field, also does not create additional stellar aberration for this observer. This means, that there are no gravitational lenses toward distant inertial observer. Also, toward him, there are no decelerations of time and light, in the foreign gravitational fields. This also means, that if distant inertial observer sees the real gravitational lenses, then gravity is absolute and TGR is wrong. According to the relativists, gravitational lenses exist for any observer, but actually this disproves TGR.

Elliptically orbiting celestial bodies also refute the hypothesis of time-delay in a gravitational field, because any such body is like a rotating mechanical clock, whose rotation accelerates at periapsis for the sake of gravitational shrinking. This is visible for example by the moons of Jupiter. Therefore, in the gravitational field, mechanical time is running faster, not slower. Actually, there may exist various types of time, as mechanical, optical etc., which may have different speeds.

Cosmological hypothesis for expansion of the Universe, can be true only if the space is empty, but in fact it is not. The thin cosmic atmosphere creates Compton effect, which looks like red Doppler effect. So, both the Hubble effect and the relic radiation are results from Compton effect. In turn, the mentioned cosmological hypothesis derives rather from the world of Minkowski, than from the Hubble effect. He himself believes, that redshift of distant galaxies is a new

optical phenomenon, not a Doppler effect. In the expansion hypothesis, the Universe is finite, has a center and is anisotropic. And since we are not in the center, the Hubble effect must be anisotropic, but actually it is isotropic. Thus, the hypothetical universal center appears all around us in deep space, i.e. this center is around the Universe, not inside it, which is impossible. Also, there is no way how the Universe has been an infinitely small hypothetical point, which expands into itself. Furthermore, the calculated relativistic speed of expansion toward deep space, significantly exceeds the speed of light, which again contradicts to the postulate of constancy of light-speed. Moreover, quasars do not follow Hubble's law. As regards the hypothetical age of the Universe, amounting about 14 billion years, it does not correspond to reality, because there are many older galactic clusters in the Cosmos. And if the Universe was infinitely small point, then must have been past infinitely much time until the Cosmos acquires its current size. Another contradiction is that the Universe and expansion are absolutised, whereas in TGR there are countless different relative realities to different observers, so for some observers the Universe may be shrinking. The hypothesis of the expansion is also contradicted by both the so-called dark matter and dark flow, because they absents from it. And besides, the relic radiation actually expresses only the present temperature of the Universe, i.e. represents a space thermal noise. This radiation is just like a thermometer, it does not prove neither expansion nor contraction of space.

Many basic nuclear phenomena, have been discovered before the advent of relativism and do not depend on it. Nuclear reactions are developed mainly through experiments, for instance so is found the controllable disintegration of uranium under the influence of slow neutrons, by Hahn. While fusion of lightweight atoms in the Sun, and in particular the synthesis of helium from hydrogen, is predicted in the mid XIX century by Prout and others. However, the relativistic hypothesis on the mechanism of nuclear fusion is wrong. According to this hypothesis, which is proposed by Eddington and further developed by Bethe, the main reason for nuclear fusion in stars is the temperature, whereas the pressure is an additional factor. In this, the emitted light has a gravitational mass and stars become lighter. It follows, that if a heavenly body is supermassive and cold, it will never begin nuclear fusion, i.e. cold fusion is impossible. But in reality, the temperature of stars is a consequence of the fusion, not a reason for it. The true cause for nuclear fusion there, is the pressure created by the absolute critical mass. Every star begins to shine, when reach such a mass. Respectively, cold nuclear fusion is possible, and even already has been made laboratorially by Fleischmann and Pons. On the other hand, hypothetical controllable thermonuclear fusion, has not yet been implemented, probably because high temperatures can disintegrate elements more, than merging them.

It is known, that the normal precession of the elliptical orbit of Mercury, is calculated with Newtonian mechanics, whereas the additional small anomalous precession of this orbit, is calculated separately through a special formula. But this additional precession is a hypothesis, dependent on conditions throughout the Solar system, and may be wrong, i.e. may not exist such a precession. Nevertheless, in TGR there is formula for calculating the additional precession of the Mercury's orbit, which formula is the same as that of Gerber derived earlier. But this formula is wrong in itself, regardless of how it has created, because it contains not one, but two unknown quantities, which are dependent on one another, they are: the Mercury's precession and the Sun's mass. This is, because the formula is made for an isolated system of two bodies, heavy and light, where the heavy central mass is represented by quantities, which are dependent from the precession of the lightweight orbiting body. In this situation, there is no way to write or to calculate, how much is the mass of the Sun, because we do not know how much is the precession of Mercury. And since the central mass is unknown, then there is no way to calculate the precession of the planet. It turns

out, that to calculate one value, we must know how big is the other, but in this formula, they both are unknown, so it is impossible to identify them. If we measure the mass of the Sun otherwise, then we must measure the precession of the Mercury otherwise too. Consequently, Gerber's formula is unnecessary and wrong. Furthermore, the observations of the precession of double stars, disproves this formula, because the results do not match with it. All in all, the formula is based on only one particular case and is arbitrary. Moreover, this formula is of classical type and is not compatible with TGR, because the given mechanical system is heliocentric, rotational and absolute, not relative. Therefore, in TGR there is no correct formula for calculating the additional precession.

Already during the XIX century, in the physics have been spoken about variable mass and gravity waves. The idea that the additional precession of a given celestial body, leads to emission of gravitational waves moving with the speed of light, was proposed back then by Gauss and others. According to him, the gravitational charge is variable, it depends on the orbital speed and diffuses with the speed of light. As a consequence, when a body orbiting along a curve line, it broadcast gravitational waves, traveling with the speed of light. In other words, there is some special friction in the gravitational field, something like gravitational ether wind. Gauss also made a hypothetical formula, adjusted especially for the additional precession of the Mercury, which formula is not valid for other bodies. Then, Gerber develops further this formula, but it became even more hypothetical and untenable. As regards the gravitational waves, tidal proves the existence of such longitudinal field waves. On the other hand, the registration of the weak gravitational waves is almost impossible, because they merge into a common background.

Universe can be observed only through astronomy, and not through quantum mechanics, so the hypothesis that particle accelerators imitate explosion of the Universe, is erroneous. Furthermore, in these accelerators there are all sorts of particles and waves, this also contradicts TGR and stultifies the statistical search of some special particles, as the so-called Higgs boson. Moreover, because in relativistic physics the space is empty and the particles are hard balls, this physics can not explain the so-called parity violation, i.e. the random decay of K^+ mesons. This has led to the hypothesis of symmetry breaking from Lee and Yang. In turn, this hypothesis serves as a basis to the assumption for Higgs boson and Higgs field. But these hypotheses are wrong, because the space is filled with viscous material fields, such as the gravitational one. Consequently, the particles are like viscous fluids and they can decay into different numbers of smaller particles. Besides, the hypothesis for Higgs field is absurd, because represents some kind of chaotic relativistic para-invariant quasi-ether. This disproves modern quantum mechanics. Also, the relativists already use the Higgs boson even before to discover it, i.e. they manufacture the truth instead of find it.

SUPPLEMENTS

The Nature can not be described by the Theory of relativity, because initial conditions in this theory are too simple, i.e. there are not enough instruments. Furthermore, empty space does not exist, since only matter can have capacity and characteristics. For that reason, it is necessary a new classical theory, which has a some kind of semi-liquid absolute ether. Fields are material objects just like the bodies, consequently the fields are the real ether and are like fluid with varied viscosity, especially the gravitational field. Thus, the solid bodies are field with very strong viscosity. Exactly in this half-fluid moves electromagnetic and gravitational waves. However, when the field is weak, the waves behave almost

like bodies, without to being such, i.e. these waves have a dualistic nature. For example, photons transform themselves from waves into something like corpuscles, during transition from substance to vacuum with feeble field. Therefore, in such a vacuum is valid the emission theory of light, whereas in substance – the wave theory. The waves have characteristic speed and do not attract with gravity, unlike the bodies. Atoms and elementary particles, also are made of viscous liquid and can merge themselves. When opposite charges fuse it results gravitational field and waves, and at rotation of charges it forms turbulent magnetic field. All individual fields are connected in a common anisotropic field. The small masses are located in the large ones and are associated with them. Local absolute intensity of a given field, defines how much is privileged its coordinate system, while when the intensity is weak, the space is conditionally empty, for example that around the Earth. In gravitational field, the velocities of time and light are variable, because it is inhomogeneous. At micro level, the field has quantum characteristics, because it is formed by several types of small elementary quanta, i.e. the field has microgranulose composition. At macro level, the field evolves through turbulent streams, like the galaxies. Thus forms a simple universal theory.

Because the light rays bend and stretch themselves during mechanical acceleration, but don't attract with gravitational field, therefore it is possible light accelerometer, which can discriminate between mechanical and gravitational acceleration. Such a device, especially with an extensible longitudinal ray, can be made by light interferometer like that of Fizeau or Jamin, but with two different parallel cameras, one empty and other of monolithic glass. To enhance the effect, it is necessary a coil of light, i.e. multiple circulation of the beam. As for device with bend transverse ray, it can be used Michelson's interferometer, but its longitudinal beam must pass through glass, and amplification can be achieved by light resonator, made with two parallel mirrors. The main difficulty for making on light accelerometers is, that the useful signal is very small and disappears in the thermal noises. For this reason the appliance must be cooled with liquid helium or used only in cosmic space.

Another way to show that the speed of light is changeable, consists of measurement of the differential stellar aberration between two opposite points of the celestial sphere. If the light-speed is invariant constant, the two points will seem as one, irrespective of the Earth's motion.

Interferometer of Michelson never had been tested in flowing water, unlike the Fizeau's interferometer. The relativistic physics suggests, that the two results will be equal, but it is possible to turn out that the result of the Michelson's interferometer is slightly different from that of Fizeau.

Thanks to the Faraday's law of electromagnetic induction, each can register its own absolute speed toward the Earth's magnetic field. A simple version to make such a device is by a metal rod and rotating plastic disk, which depolarizes the rod as rubs at its both ends. This appliance, except as a generator, can work also as an engine, if it be supplied with electricity.

CONCLUSION

Already is pretty clear that the relativism is meaningless. So it is necessary a new natural objective theory, which should be composed by facts.