

# Einstein's relativity is bad

Roger J Anderton

[R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com](mailto:R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com)

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy tries to take a stance of defending Einstein's relativity; but really the Encyclopedia points out it is nonsense.

According to Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy on Einstein's relativity, quotes Bertrand Russell [1]:

“There has been a tendency, not uncommon in the case of a new scientific theory, for every philosopher to interpret the work of Einstein in accordance with his own metaphysical system, and to suggest that the outcome is a great accession of strength to the views which the philosopher in question previously held. This cannot be true in all cases; and it may be hoped that it is true in none. It would be disappointing if so fundamental a change as Einstein has introduced involved no philosophical novelty.”

i.e. there are a lot of philosophies and attempts have been made by these different philosophies to interpret Einstein's relativity; there is not one point of view as to what Einstein's relativity means.

We have Einstein's point of view as to what Einstein's relativity means and we have other peoples' point of view as to what Einstein's relativity means. If we had one point of view we would have consistency. But we don't because we have lots of different views, hence inconsistency.

We could define Einstein's relativity as needing to be understood from Einstein's point of view. But the problem there is that people will insist on interpreting Einstein's relativity from their point of view and not following rigidly to Einstein; thus they then make Einstein's relativity inconsistent. If on the other hand we do somehow manage to stick to Einstein's relativity and insist it be interpreted Einstein's way; we find that Einstein says contradictory things; because one moment says one thing

then later says something else; he is inconsistent. (Example: one moment Einstein discards aether and later reinstates it. [2])

So what we are reduced to is - what path do we want to go with Einstein's relativity – with both giving us inconsistency.

Next the math issue, Stanford Encyclopedia says:

“Further lack of clarity stemmed from the scientific *literati* who provided differing, and at times, conflicting mathematical or physical accounts of the theory's fundamental principles.”

i.e. different math has been put forward as to being Einstein's relativity. It depends upon who you read as to what is the math of Einstein's relativity; different people have given different math. Once again we have the choice of sticking rigidly with Einstein's math or going with other peoples' math. As with the philosophy issue we have Einstein being inconsistent; leading us with a choice of the math being inconsistent whether we follow Einstein rigidly or we don't follow Einstein.

As to how far Einstein understood relativity, consider when he was reading books on the subject he could not understand it either: “I myself can hardly understand Laue's book. (Einstein about the first text book on special relativity 1914)” [2]

Einstein's relativity is just not a decent foundation to build a scientific theory on. Stanford Encyclopedia tries to make out that a “theory” is supposed to be like that by stating:

“This is not unusual: physical theories, if sufficiently robust, are rarely, if ever, without unproblematic aspects, often taken to say different things at different stages of development. But the very fluidity of physical and mathematical meaning lent interpretative latitude for inherently antagonistic philosophical viewpoints seeking vindication, confirmation or illumination by the revolutionary new theory.”

What it means by “robust” is that it keeps changing; keeps changing as Einstein changes his mind and keeps changing as people try different ways to try to make sense of it. It is not a clearly defined theory.

If Einstein presented a proper theory (or theories) of relativity that was clearly defined then we could mount a decent attack on that, but he does not; he leaves us with something that keeps changing.

That just leaves us with the cult of his persona – where he has followers who look upon him like he were a saint or a god. Then when faced with that all we can do is attack such a cult as being nonsense.

And the way the cult tries to defend itself is by setting up diversions, because the “theory” (or theories) is insubstantial.

If we wanted to build upon a relativity theory then we needed something better than Einstein's (we needed someone else's), because its just rubbish. Before Einstein's relativity there was Galileo's relativity and Newtonian physics - and that we should go back to.

## References

[1] Early Philosophical Interpretations of General Relativity, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy  
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/genrel-early/>

[2] Did Einstein Not Understand Math? Claes Johnson <http://knol.google.com/k/did-einstein-not-understand-math#>

[note] I work from math models, and math models can be updated, hence when Einstein worked on Special Relativity in the form that he treated it – it was the basis for what could be updated to include extra effects. The fact that this math modelling was done by someone so incompetent as Einstein has messed up physics; who did not make it clear what he was doing because he did not provide adequate references for what he was working from etc.

c.RJAnderton29-12-2011