

# Myron Evans' criticism of relativity

Roger J. Anderton  
R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

Myron Evans proposes a Unified Field Theory and criticises mainstream physics; some of those issues will be looked at.

## 1. Einstein-Cartan-Evans (ECE) theory

According to Wikipedia [1] : “The Einstein–Cartan–Evans theory is a unified theory of physics proposed by Myron W. Evans, which claims to unify general relativity, quantum mechanics and electromagnetism.”

Myron Evans says however that he has [2] : “many refutations of Einsteinian general relativity made in the [his unified field theory] UFT papers.”

So Wikipedia should probably be claiming Evans modifies general relativity before unifying it with quantum mechanics and electromagnetism; instead of what its claiming.

However, Wikipedia goes on to say [1] :”Evans' claims are not accepted by the mainstream physics community.”

Myron Evans' Unified Field Theory seems to have been dismissed by the mainstream on the grounds that it is not Lorentz invariant and other reasons [3] . Jay Wacker, [4] Professor at Stanford University gives the other grounds [3] as: “The few people who have ventured into looking into the work have found that theory isn't Lorentz invariant. Just looking at it, I stop looking when strong and electroweak interactions aren't discussed. This would be like someone in 1940 trying to come up with an alternate theory of electromagnetism (established in 1880) without mentioning quantum mechanics and general relativity. You should address the multitude of data that has been accumulated over the past 60 years. The understanding of nature has advanced since 1955 when only electricity and gravity were known.”

From my position there is a great deal wrong with the revolution in physics initiated by Einstein; so I am quite happy to look at theories that are not Lorentz invariant (i.e. disagrees with special relativity) and theories disagreeing with mainstream on quantum and general relativity theories. But

as Professor Wacker illustrates the mainstream is not prepared to look at things in that way and expect building upon the changes that Einstein made. So as far as I am concerned they have mental blind-spot; they have been educated (education is like brainwashing as many have noted) to be like that.

From my experience with Wikipedia – it is patrolled by people who like to delete non-mainstream physics points-of-view. For the moment ECE theory seems to have slipped through their net.

I will now look at what ECE theory supporters say about mainstream:

## **2. Criticisms of mainstream physics from proponents of ECE theory**

Evans (et al) point out [5] : “For a long time in the mid twentieth century the subject of general relativity was quiet, because it was difficult and only a few hundred people in the world could really understand it. Einstein was sidelined by the younger generation of the Copenhagen school of quantum mechanics.”

Yes, as dealt with in my articles regarding the history of Einstein becoming famous in 1919. There was a great deal of criticism of Einstein's general relativity. A very important expert on relativity was Professor Silberstein who was pointing out that Newtonian physics could really still handle the issues being claimed of by general relativity; so there was no real need to change from Newtonian physics to general relativity.

“ In the forties and fifties however the subject began to gather momentum due to the work of scientists such as Hoyle, Bondi, Wheeler and Vigier.”

There was what was called a Renaissance in Einstein's relativity, Clifford Wills [6]: “During the two decades 1960-80, the subject of general relativity experienced a rebirth.”

Evans (et al) point out Fred Hoyle became a famous figure in physics with his theory of nucleosynthesis in the universe and “Hoyle did not use the idea of an expanding universe at all, and coined the term “big bang” in derision. He was saying that the idea is absurd.”

“However, a new generation of scientists, notably Hawking and Penrose claimed to have proven mathematically that the universe must have started in a state of infinite density and zero volume.”

Evans thinks “this claim is absurd and it is now known to be incorrect mathematically through the work of [his work] AIAS.”

Evans claims that Einstein had also rejected it as absurd.

That is contrary to how the mainstream presents it. Mark Midbon [7] reports: “ In January 1933, the Belgian mathematician and Catholic priest Georges Lemaitre traveled with Albert Einstein to California for a series of seminars. After the Belgian detailed his Big Bang theory, Einstein stood up applauded, and said, “This is the most beautiful and satisfactory explanation of creation to which I have ever listened.””

So initially Einstein did accept the idea. I find though that in general - Einstein kept changing his mind a lot. So the mainstream seems to go by Einstein's initial belief and not his change of mind. Mainstream does similar with regards to ether; Einstein initially thought it superfluous then changed

his mind. But mainstream is usually stuck in quagmire of Einstein's initial opinion.

According to Evans for the maths of the Big Bang – “The flaws in the EH [Einstein-Hilbert] equation have been pointed out repeatedly for ninety years, notably by the Nobel Laureates Schroedinger and Dirac, and by the pioneer of tensor algebra, Levi-Civita.”

However, despite this Evans says: “The debate over big bang between Hoyle and Hawking and Penrose seemed to result in acceptance of big bang, so that it gradually became dogma towards the end of the twentieth century. Hoyle resigned in disgust from his chair in Cambridge, to get away from the time wasting academic politics and aggravation.”

According to Evans: “Hoyle and many others have produced conclusive arguments against big bang. There are many experimental data that clearly refute big bang, even on a wikipedia site controlled by the small dogmatic faction of physics known as the standard model. The universe is a big place, and it is not clear that the human mind will be able to understand it. Big bang is certainly not the answer.”

Mainstream has however got behind the dogma of big bang. Evans blames this on: “due to lack of understanding, physics as a subject began to balloon out of control towards the end of the twentieth century and became a plethora of absurd ideas which cannot be tested against data. There are far too many loose ends in string theory for example, strings are twisted to fit an idea, not the real world of nature. Dark matter for example is just a stop gap measure used to fit data, in this case data from the evolution of spiral galaxies. Dark matter does not come from any coherent philosophy, in particular, dark matter does not come from relativity. The danger is of slipping back into mediaeval times by accepting wild ideas about nature, and not using the test of experimentation. This is as if the enlightenment of Bacon and Newton for example had never happened.”

Evans then promotes his theory: “the Einstein Cartan Evans (ECE) unified field theory. This theory uses a more complete geometry than that due to Riemann, a geometry that was devised by the mathematician Cartan in the twenties and which is actually well known.”

He claims that “the EH equation is incorrect due to its neglect of torsion of space-time. The torsion is the spinning of spacetime, whereas Einstein considered only the curving of spacetime. The ECE theory uses only the four dimensions of spacetime, so is much simpler and much more powerful than string theory, which unfortunately uses a multitude of dimensions that have never been observed in nature.”

From my point-of-view we have mathematical modelling process so can start from a math model without torsion and then update.

Evans: “During these years, from 2003 to present, Crothers showed that the methods used to infer the Hawking Penrose singularities are incorrect at a fundamental level. So from several angles it was found that big bang and dark matter do not exist, despite all the propaganda on TV. The way in which a spiral galaxy evolves for example can be found using torsion as a basic idea. So the maps of dark matter are maps of torsion, an idea which comes from a self-consistent philosophy of relativity.”

Really then to a large extent- just a theory that updates relativity.

He then accuses the mainstream of trying to suppress the theory: “have used very dubious methods to try to suppress the theory instead of accepting its advantages as they should.”

He says: “In the area of cosmology, ECE theory comes down on the side of Einstein, Hoyle and Crothers, three notable thinkers who reject big bang entirely. In fact many scientists now reject big bang, because anyone who really puts their mind to it can see that the theory is untenable, both experimentally and theoretically. In light of the 2007 collapse of the EH equation the theory is complete nonsense.”

He says: “The standard version of physics has degenerated into often incorrect dogma over the years”.

There is censorship in physics journals according to Myron Evans and he says: “The blacklisting of new thought occurs in the Institute of Physics for example. Ordinary secretaries with no scientific training are instructed to reject papers in which appear ideas critical of the standard faction. This practice has been severely condemned by the profession worldwide, as we see from [www.aias.us](http://www.aias.us) feedback.”

Evans: “the standard model is riddled with errors. For example, its gravitational sector is general relativity, whereas its electromagnetic sector is still nineteenth century special relativity. This is a complete mismatch. Its classical part comes from the seventeenth century, where an event or happening is caused by something, and its quantum part is based on the concept of indeterminacy, where things are unknowable and are not caused by anything at all.”

My papers also deal with these errors in the mainstream.

To those who think the Einstein field equation is the most successful of all time, and Einstein was a great genius, and anyone who thinks otherwise is a scientific lunatic. Evans replies: “It has been known for ninety years that the Einstein field equation is riddled with errors and obscurity. There has been a cover up of cosmological proportions. Finally in 2007 the equation was refuted by the AIAS group using the computer, and replaced by well tested ECE theory. So predictions of an incorrect equation, such as big bang, black holes, dark matter, and all the rest of it are incorrect too.”

Evans says [8]: “I have had occasion to study Einstein’s work in great detail, and have found numerous errors in it. Physics is saturated with dogma, the most rational subject is in fact the most irrational. This type of problem comes from poor historical scholarship and poor understanding of fundamentals.”

He even lays an attack on Newton.

From my studies on the History of Physics – the big problem with teaching Newtonian physics to physics students is that they are never taught about Boscovich, and Boscovich gives us the unified theory of Newtonian physics. So the Newtonian physics taught to physics students is incomplete.

Evans: “ So how did Einstein’s dogma become so entrenched? I have no doubt that there is merit in Einstein’s work in relativity, merit in its basic and ancient idea that physics is geometry, but a lot of it went wrong very early on and in order to see this with clarity a little accurate history is needed.”

Of course he decides to start with that history by going back to the geometry of the ancient Greek philosophers.

When he starts talking of Maxwell's electromagnetism theory seems to start to go wrong, he says:

“Maxwell realized that light does not travel faster than  $c$ .”

It does not seem to me that Maxwell had that opinion. It is usually presented in the mainstream that Einstein had read that interpretation into Maxwell's theory, and from that built special relativity (SR).

Evans: “The first relativists, Heaviside, Fitzgerald and Lorentz, realized that it cannot travel faster than  $c$ , and threw Newton away.”

From my studies, initially this maths was interpreted as consistent with Newtonian physics. It was the coming from Einstein that threw all of this into confusion.

Evans: “The word “relativity” came into fashion because of the Lorentz transform, needed to explain the results of the Michelson Morley experiment. Although challenged by a few contemporary thinkers, and they may be right, the Michelson Morley experiment is to most physicists reproducible and repeatable. In the Michelson Morley experiment light is proven to be the same whether or not it travels with the earth's rotation. The linear velocity  $v$  of the earth's surface does not add to  $c$ , there is no  $v$  plus  $c$ .”

From my studies I find that is just not so; false claims are made of the Michelson-Morley experiments, and it seems Evans has been suckered into believing those false claims also. The Michelson-Morley experiment does not show that lightspeed is constant; those who claim it does are making false claims. As dealt with by my papers- Michelson-Morley experiment can still be dealt with by variable lightspeed and Newtonian physics.

I checked with Crothers (who seems to have been working with Evans) and he recognises that mainstream has been making false claims about the Michelson-Morley experiment. Subsequently, maybe Evans has also recognised that.

Evans: “In my opinion relativity began with the Lorentz transform although Heaviside came very close to the right answer. Fitzgerald got the right answer in words.”

That is quite a few people's opinions, then Einstein came along and placed a different interpretation on this maths of Lorentz transform as used in Lorentz theory; and from my position-- Einstein was just confused.

Evans then goes on to talk about time dilation, whereby moving clocks are observed slower, he says: “This phenomenon has been verified experimentally to astonishingly high precision, and this is meaningful relativity, worked out not by Einstein, but by Lorentz and others such as Voigt long before Einstein's work of 1905. The jargon is horrendous, and the phenomenon is known as “time dilatation”. All it means is that the watch runs slow on board a plane. This type of relativity was developed elegantly by Lorentz and Poincare in the context of electrodynamics using the then new tensor methods of Levi-Civita, Ricci, Bianchi and others around 1900.”

So, he is seemingly trying to assign SR to others before Einstein. However, there is a subtle difference between these people working on SR-type ideas before Einstein gave SR in 1905. And Evans does not seem aware of it. The Lorentz-Poincare theory is not exactly same as Einstein 1905 theory. The Lorentz-Poincare theory is still Newtonian physics. While Einstein 1905 theory is a collection of Einstein's confusions. As regards time dilation that involves adjusting clocks to keep lightspeed as constant; if that is not done then there is no time dilation. These issues dealt with by my papers.

Evans as noted earlier was criticising the maths that the mainstream has been adopted through Penrose and Hawking; he claimed it was absurd.

Penrose now seems to agree (to some extent) in an interview to Discover magazine he says physics is wrong from string theory to quantum mechanics. [8]

The other man - Hawking still seems riding high on that maths though!

An interesting quote from the Discover article is: “He [Penrose] reinterpreted general relativity to prove that black holes can form from dying stars.” It means the maths was changed. So we have the era when Hoyle was top-man in cosmology claiming that Big Bang was absurd, then he was dethroned and the maths changed (or reinterpreted) and the observation of cosmic background radiation (and others observations) interpreted also from that change.

The old way was overthrown by the mainstream, but the dissident movement still carries on for the old way.

## References

[1] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Einstein%E2%80%93Cartan%E2%80%93Evans\\_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Einstein%E2%80%93Cartan%E2%80%93Evans_theory)  
Wikipedia 13Jan2012

[2] <http://drmyronevans.wordpress.com/2011/12/04/latest-version-of-meaningless-relativity-3/>

[3] <http://www.quora.com/Is-there-a-successor-to-Myron-Evans-Unified-Field-Theory>

[4] <http://www.quora.com/Jay-Wacker>

[5] Script for Film: “The Universe of Myron Evans”  
[http://aias.us/documents/mwe/The\\_Universe\\_of\\_Myron\\_Evans.pdf](http://aias.us/documents/mwe/The_Universe_of_Myron_Evans.pdf)

[6] The New Physics, ed. Paul Davies, 1992, ISBN-13: 978-0521438315 p 7

[7] 'A Day Without Yesterday': Georges Lemaitre & the Big Bang, Mark Midbon  
<http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/science/sc0022.html>

[8] Meaningless relativity, a long essay, Myron Evans  
<http://drmyronevans.files.wordpress.com/2011/12/meaningless-relativity.pdf>

[9] [Discover Interview](#) Roger Penrose Says Physics Is Wrong, From String Theory to Quantum Mechanics, by Susan Kruglinski Sept 2009, [http://discovermagazine.com/2009/sep/06-discover-interview-roger-penrose-says-physics-is-wrong-string-theory-quantum-mechanics/article\\_view?b\\_start:int=0](http://discovermagazine.com/2009/sep/06-discover-interview-roger-penrose-says-physics-is-wrong-string-theory-quantum-mechanics/article_view?b_start:int=0)

c.RJAnderton14Jan2012