the general science journal

Its OK to say Einstein is wrong

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

What a dissident astronomer has to say is contrasted with what an Einstein believer says, and then its pointed out this means it is OK to say Einstein is wrong; because the case of the Einstein believers evaporate.

Hilton Ratcliffe describes himself as a dissident astronomer who has struggled for 30-years to try to put the "physical" back into "physics".[1]

He says there is " blatant skewing of scientific data by an informally associated league of mathematical theorists. The author argues that the method adopted by scientific elite not only leads the world up the garden path, but also brings with it a slew of associated misconceptions."

In his book he says he :"details the nuances of classical relativity, compares them with the abstractions proposed by Einstein, and exposes the scientific malpractice that was used to entrench Albert Einstein and his theories as models of advanced thinking. Famous experimental verifications of Special and General Relativity are dissected and found wanting, and experiments clearly falsifying tenets of Einstein's theoretical model are discussed. Alternative explanations using non-relativistic physics are suggested."

He continues his analysis: "discusses the implications of quasi-scientific theories that completely abandon experimental evidence and logic. We meet Planck, Heisenberg, Schrödinger, Dirac, and Hawking. Beginning with the intrinsically implausible case of quantum mechanics, the chapter traces the decline of theoretical physics to the point where it becomes unapologetically irrational."

He explains how Einstein started the trend of sanctifying nonsense [2] : "I have colleagues who have been barred from observatories, had been refused publication, had research funding withdrawn, lost jobs and even been chased from their country of birth -– all because they insisted on publicly announcing what they had seen in the heavens, which did not fit the preferred model. They have so much courage it makes my eyes water. They almost literally put their lives on the line. They are the Galileos of our time."

Further on says: "[Einstein] Theory would be more interesting if it were logical and comprehensible. In the case of mathematical theory, it is neither. There have been no new fundamental discoveries in physics for over half a century."

"Physics is dying, being suffocated by meta-mathematics, and physics departments at major universities with grand histories in physical science are closing down for lack of interest. It is a crisis in my view. My belief, therefore, is that physics should be taught with less emphasis on math

and more on empiricism. Let's get back to when physics worked in the real world and formed the backbone of applied sciences. Only then will we progress as we should."

"Professor Don Scott told me once, "The problems with cosmology and astrophysics in the modern era are not scientific so much as sociological." The Big Bang Theory is a faith-based system. People believe it because they want to believe it, not because they have been convinced by the supporting data.

"When Einstein was ready to write down what was to become his General Theory of Relativity [GTR], he found that the mathematics required by such a concept were quite beyond him. He consequently engaged the services of his friend, mathematics professor Marcel Grossman, to construct the mathematical formalism. Grossman felt, for reasons we can only speculate, that the best way to achieve this was to use a new and arcane mathematical language called Differential Geometry.

"It is estimated that when GTR was published in 1915, only about a dozen specialist meta-mathematicians in the world could decipher the math. Yet, before long, Einstein was the focus of intense international adulation by millions of people. Since only a minute fraction of those fans could understand the theory, there had to be another reason for the adulation.

"It was not the workings or the plausibility of the theory that impressed people so much that they created from it an enduring dogma. It was a psychosocial imperative that characterized all widely defended dogma, including Big Bang Theory, of course, which is the offspring of GTR. Once the new dogma has become entrenched within the educational system, it is done and dusted. Universities (mostly inadvertently) become in effect propaganda machines and produce scientists who quite frankly cannot practice or teach physics any other way.

"If, as in the case of GTR and later with Big Bang Theory and Black Hole theory, the protagonists have seductive charisma (which Einstein, Gamow, and Hawking, respectively, had in abundance) then the theory, though not the least bit understood, becomes the darling of the media. GTR and Big Bang Theory are sacrosanct, and it's most certainly not because they make any sense. In fact, they have become the measure by which we sanctify nonsense."

He reports on the first Cosmology in Crisis conference [3] :

"World-renowned mathematical physicist Professor Huseyin Yilmaz, formerly of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University, and his hands-on experimentalist colleague Professor Carrol Alley of the University of Maryland, introduced us to the Yilmaz cosmology. Altogether 4 papers were presented at CCC-1 [Crisis in Cosmology Conference number 1] on various aspects of Yilmaz theory, and a fifth, by Dr Hal Puthoff of the Institute of Advanced Studies at Austin, was brought to the conference but not presented.

"It is no longer controversial to suggest that GR has flaws, although I still feel awkward saying it out loud! Professor Yilmaz focussed on the fact that GR excludes gravitational stress-energy as a source of curvature. Consequently, stress-energy is merely a coordinate artefact in GR, whereas in the Yilmaz modification it is a true tensor. Hal Puthoff described the GR term to me as a "pseudo-

tensor, which can appear or disappear depending on how you treat mass."

"The crucial implication of this, in the words of Professor Alley, is that since "interactions are carried by the field stress energy, there are no interactive n-body solutions to the field equations of General Relativity." In plain language, GR is a single-body description of gravity! The Yilmaz equations contain the correct terms, and they have been applied with success to various vexing problems, for example the precession of Mercury's perihelion, lunar laser ranging measurements, the flying of atomic clocks in aircraft, the relativistic behaviour of clocks in the GPS, and the predicted Sagnac effect in the one-way speed of light on a rotating table. Anecdote from Professor Alley: at a lecture by Einstein in the 1920's, Professor Sagnac was in the audience. He questioned Einstein on the gedanken experiment regarding contra-radiating light on a rotating plate. Einstein thought for a while and said, "That has got nothing to do with relativity". Sagnac loudly replied, "In that case, Dr Einstein, relativity has got nothing to do with reality!""

So Einstein chooses to ignore certain things; his theorising was only set up to deal with certain things and other things outside that he was ignoring.

John Farrell writing in Cosmos magazine attacks dissident scientists such as Radcliffe [4] :

"A burgeoning underground of 'dissident' scientists and self-described experts publish their theories in newsletters and blogs on the Net, exchanging ideas in a great battle against 'the temple of relativity'. According to these critics, relativity is not only wrong, it's an affront to common sense, and its creator, Albert Einstein, was no less than a cheat."

Farrell manages to get a scientist Bryan Gaensler, a professor of physics at the University of Sydney to criticise the Crisis in Cosmology Conference:

He says "there has just begun a new series of conferences, held by anti-relativity cranks, called 'Crisis in Cosmology'. I think the first one was held in Spain and they're planning another. It looks exactly like a legitimate scientific conference, with the difference that everyone delivering a talk there is insane."

That's quite interesting. There is one group of scientists calling the other group of scientists insane. One group must be insane. Gaensler must be an Einstein supporter. So the battle-lines are clearly drawn between Einstein supporters and those who say Einstein is wrong.

When teaching Einstein's relativity – the lecturers often like to emphasis that the student needs to abandon ordinary feelings of common-sense. So it is quite easy to see if a student does not abandon common-sense then those people who have abandoned common-sense i.e. Einstein believers then appear insane to that student.

Now Gaensler taking as representative of Einstein believers wants to declare those who have not abandoned common-sense like himself are the ones insane. Clearly, he does not want to appreciate how he and others like him appear to these dissident scientists who don't support Einstein.

Cosmos article continues:

"The conference planners sent out invitations to Gaensler and hundreds of other physicists. "Before registering," he says, "you had to fill out this 10-point, bulleted manifesto, agreeing to all sorts of propositions from the start. For example, 'I do not accept that the universe is expanding', and so on, the kind of thing you would never see at a real scientific conference. It was hilarious."

It needs emphasis that as an Einstein believer what he means by a “real scientific conference” must be one where all the participants have gone through an education system of accepting Einstein and thus abandoning common-sense.

A conference not wanting such believers who would stagnate the discussion obviously are not wanted.

Cosmos article says: “The anti-relativity movement got under way as soon as Einstein's first paper on special relativity was published, in 1905. Some scientists disputed its assertion that the old Newtonian concepts of absolute space and time — which had never been scientifically established — were superfluous. Indeed, the attempt to restore these concepts to mainstream physics has been the essential foundation of almost every crank theory since.”

Yes that is correct, the Einstein is wrong group has been going for a very long time, and as pointed out by History studies such as by McCausland – their voice has been ignored. The acceptance of Einstein's relativity went through the mainstream without debate on the issue and the voice of those who did not believe was not allowed to be heard. That group of dissidents has not gone away by being ignored by the Einstein believers, it has just carried on growing.

Cosmos: “Even more enraging to some scientists and engineers was the worldwide fame Einstein attained with the 1916 publication of his General Theory of Relativity, which extended special relativity and offered a radically new explanation for gravity.”

Yes only “some”, while others did not accept Einstein's relativity. The massive publicity campaign set up by the news media to proclaim that Einstein was a genius did not convince everyone, and there were criticisms that were ignored.

Cosmos: “A number of Germans, many of them anti-Semites, despised Einstein's socialist views and envied his fame. Outside Germany, however, Einstein's theory also met resistance. “

Yes, but not all criticism was anti-Semitic, some was criticism of the science and those criticisms were ignored.

Cosmos: “Albert Michelson, famous as the American who devised the failed Michelson-Morley experiment to detect aether, the invisible medium that 19th century scientists supposed responsible for the propagation of light waves through space, never accepted relativity and he politely admitted this to Einstein when they met.”

So we have Michelson as an example of a scientist that never accepted Einstein's relativity, we then wonder if the Cosmos article then wants to classify him as a “crank” also. These Einstein believers just never address the issues that the skeptics have as regards Einstein's relativity and just want the easy option of name calling them. Interesting issue this ether. As dealt with in my papers – Einstein discarded ether in 1905 but in 1920s was bringing it back. So the Einstein believers who discard ether go by Einstein 1905 not by the 1920s Einstein. My position - Einstein 1920s was correct on that issue if not on all issues.

Cosmos: "But there is a pattern," he says. "They're always male — never female. Normally professionals of some kind, doctors, pilots, engineers. And they're always retired and have years to spend on their pet theory.

I have counter example there was a lady Caroline Thompson see my paper Bring Back the ether.

Gaensler then goes onto say how he ignores the “cranks” who say Einstein's relativity is wrong, and accuses them of not knowing the scientific method.

I disagree and say its the Einstein believers who don't properly understand the scientific method. Einstein made lots of changes when the physics community adopted him as a genius and as part of that had to change the scientific method to accommodate him; from my perspective that is a corruption of the scientific method.

Cosmos: "What's common to all of them, I find," says Gaensler, "is their failure to appreciate the distinction between cosmologists and astronomers. Now, I'm an astronomer, and I work on stars and gases inside the galaxy. And when they talk to me, present their theory, and then ask me, 'Don't you care that your field could be completely undermined by my theory?' They don't understand that, whether the Big Bang turns out to be misguided or wrong, it has little to do with objects I study inside the galaxy. They fail to appreciate that."

Well I think most of them appreciate that cosmology is the theorising and the observations are being fitted into that theorising, so when these astronomers write up their reports they write them up in terms of that cosmology/theorising.

Cosmos: “Some anti-Einstein crusaders do have professional scientific training, and this makes them more interesting, even if no more convincing, than the general lot. Over the past few years, for example, American astronomer Tom Van Flandern, who once worked for the U.S. Naval Observatory in Washington and runs a website (www.metaresearch.org) with a newsletter that promotes interest in scientific ideas "outside of the mainstream of theories in Astronomy", claims to have discovered a dirty secret.”

“Van Flandern was hired to do some consulting work for the physics department at the University of Maryland on the global positioning system (GPS), the ring of 24 satellites circling the Earth, which, among other convenient attributes, are able to pinpoint precise locations for befuddled automobile drivers and bushwalkers anywhere on the planet. According to him, the confusing "rigmarole" of relativity isn't needed to maintain the GPS, even though in theory it should be.”

“Einstein's theory of relativity says that, for something moving very fast, such as a satellite, time would seem to move more slowly compared with something standing still on the Earth. Van Flandern has argued that clock rates on GPS satellites should therefore need to be adjusted continuously to keep them synchronised with users on Earth. But they're not, he told Tom Bethell, a senior editor of The American Spectator magazine and author of The Politically Incorrect Guide to Science. The GPS programmers don't need relativity. "They have basically blown off Einstein," Van Flandern said.”

I am not keen on all of van Flandern's theorising but he does have a point on this issue.

Cosmos: “Is this true? Could this be a real crack in the 'temple' of Einstein's theory? Neil Ashby, a professor of physics who works at the University of Colorado and specialises in theoretical general relativity with practical applications, doesn't think so.”

"It is incorrect to claim that no relativistic corrections are used after launch. Actually, because GPS satellites are in eccentric orbits, they suffer frequency variations due to their varying speeds and varying heights above the Earth's surface. Information is transmitted down to the receivers from each satellite, which enables receivers to make a relativistic correction, which accounts for these effects."

So in Ashby's opinion – Einstein's physics is used for GPS. In the dissident side there is now GPS

engineer Ron Hatch saying it isn't. So there is a difference in opinions that is worth considering. I am on the dissident side.

Cosmos article then goes onto attack van Flandern's claims against Einstein's relativity. Apparently van Flandern did not say things very well.

Cosmos: “Astronomers have long observed that Mercury's orbit is elliptical and that the point where the planet draws closest to the Sun moves, like the oval end of an ellipse drawn with a spirograph. Over the years this 'perihelion' point revolves around the Sun just like the planet itself. It was assumed to be due to gravity and the proximity of the planet to the Sun, but Newtonian theory could never predict its advance accurately.”

That is disputable, Newtonian theory could explain it but extra effects had to be added such as a mysterious planet Vulcan whose existence was not confirmed.

Cosmos: “It was a classic problem by the time Einstein came along, and his General Theory of Relativity solved it immediately.”

Einstein came up with a solution but it did not prove that solution superior over other solutions that could be constructed from Newtonian physics. But Einstein believers want to overlook that and just believe the Einstein solution.

Cosmos article then gets diverted to wondering who the man was who said: “ it was his impression that, 'knowing the answer,' Einstein had 'jiggered the arguments until they came out with the right value'."” And traced it to Carroll Alley who claimed it was not an accurate quote, and went onto explain that perihelion was 43 arc seconds per century more than Newton's theory predicted was known by a lot of people.

Cosmos: "A lot of people say that he didn't know it, but he did," said Alley. Indeed, the burning question at the time Einstein was working on general relativity was not what the perihelion figure was, but how to account for it without making special assumptions.”

So in other words adding special assumptions to Newtonian physics and could then still get agreement with the observed perihelion. As for a supposedly different theory to Newton's that would itself be a special assumption.

See my paper “No evidence for general relativity” – there is still issues with how to interpret the perihelion i.e. from what assumptions.

Cosmos: “ This is a key point, because cranks offer all sorts of counter-theories that rely on nothing but special assumptions.”

Yes there are all sorts of counter-theories. I note the word “crank” - that is just to smear anyone with a different counter-theory to Einstein's theory. When the situation is – what theory should it be interpreted from – Einstein's theory or from another theory. There is often no adequate evidence either way, and believing Einstein – well that is just an assumption as well. So rather than address the real issue of why Einstein instead of other theories, the Einstein believers just want to smear.

Cosmos article continues when Van Flandern was asked for: “clarification about the quote he had given to the Spectator regarding Einstein's alleged tampering, he answered, "Basically, the choice of coefficients of potential phi in the space-time metric is arbitrary. Einstein knew the unmodelled perihelion motion of Mercury, and therefore confined his attention to metrics that predicted this

quantity correctly."”

Which Steve Carlip at the University of California at Davis explained the statement by van Flandern does not seem to make sense: “”It makes no sense at all," … "Van Flandern seems to have invented a free parameter where none exists. There is one free parameter, but it's just Newton's gravitational constant, G, and is fixed completely by the requirement that the theory reduce to Newtonian gravity in the weak-field, low-velocity limit. Once you've fixed that, everything else is completely determined." According to Carlip, "Van Flandern seems to be under the impression that there are a bunch of adjustable parameters in general relativity that can be fiddled with. This is certainly not true." He added, "As far as I can tell, Van Flandern simply doesn't understand the Einstein field equations."”

“Other physicists I queried also flatly reject the notion that Einstein ever fooled with his figures. "I doubt very much that Einstein had any problem calculating [the perihelion]," wrote Ted Jacobson, a gravitation specialist at the University of Maryland.”

Van Flandern not being that clear or accurate then just opens the door for the rest of the article to smear the dissidents as cranks; and for them (Einstein believers) to avoid the issue of why Einstein’s theory instead of other theories.

Back to conferences like Crisis in Cosmology – they point out the difficulties in the cosmology; which are mainly just problems that Einstein left us with his theorising.

.
If we pick up the Cosmos article on Carroll Alley who it took as an authority figure to dismiss van Flandern as a crank, it says of Carroll that he is a working physicist who received his doctorate from Princeton within a decade of Einstein's death in 1962 and attended attended the last lecture given by Einstein given before his death in 1955.

Hilton Ratcliffe informs us that Prof Carrol Alley was at the first Crisis in Cosmology conference.

Hilton informs us that Alley was presenting the Yilmaz theory: “Professor Alley, is that since “interactions are carried by the field stress energy, there are no interactive n-body solutions to the field equations of General Relativity.” In plain language, GR is a single-body description of gravity! The Yilmaz equations [from Yilmaz theory] contain the correct terms, and they have been applied with success to various vexing problems, for example the precession of Mercury’s perihelion, lunar laser ranging measurements, the flying of atomic clocks in aircraft, the relativistic behaviour of clocks in the GPS, and the predicted Sagnac effect in the one-way speed of light on a rotating table.”

So, Alley is one of those dissident scientists presenting a different theory to Einstein's (presumably trying to build on Einstein to some extent), and he is using that alternative theory to try to explain effects explained by Einstein's. He is this someone who the Cosmos article would like to dismiss as crank.

I.e. the Cosmos article is being inconsistent with its “crank” labelling, one moment it likes to give respect to a scientist if by doing so can dismiss a dissident scientist as a “crank”, but does not want to look at its scientist to see if that scientist also fits its criterion of being a “crank”.

The Cosmos article is thus just biased and prejudiced not wanting to look at the real issue of alternatives to Einstein and just wants to keep the faith with Einstein. It tries to pretend otherwise and says:

"None of the physicists I spoke to pretend that relativity is somehow sacrosanct, as dissenters typically complain. Smolin, for example, is working on a quantum theory of gravity."

So it allows some amendments.

But it adds that statement with a lot of false claims such as: "To say nothing of the other daily confirmations of the [Einstein's] theory's consequences provided by atomic accelerators, the GPS and, of course, the equivalence of mass and energy derived from special relativity in Einstein's most famous equation, $E=mc^2$."

The GPS issue dealt with earlier when I said according to GPS Engineer Ron Hatch – Einstein's relativity not used. And $E=mc^2$ was actually derived by Einstein from Newtonian physics pointed out in one of my papers.

So the Einstein believers try to put on the pretence of being open-minded to theoretical update, but they are working from making false claims about Einstein's relativity, so refusing update to that bit they defend by their falsehood. Their case then disappears like a fabulous oozlum bird flying round in circles and then vanishing up its own backside. [5]

While for dissidents like Hilton Ratcliffe the things - like what Prof Carol says means it is okay to say Einstein is wrong.

In his words: "World-renowned mathematical physicist Professor Huseyin Yilmaz, formerly of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University, and his hands-on experimentalist colleague Professor Carrol Alley of the University of Maryland, introduced us to the Yilmaz cosmology. Altogether 4 papers were presented at CCC-1 on various aspects of Yilmaz theory, and a fifth, by Dr Hal Puthoff of the Institute of Advanced Studies at Austin, was brought to the conference but not presented. It is no longer controversial to suggest that GR has flaws, although I still feel awkward saying it out loud! "

The attendants at the Cosmology in Crisis accept Einstein as wrong, but articles such as the one by Cosmos are keeping the "old" faith and still believing in Einstein, refusing to address the real issues and smearing anyone who goes against their faith. This is the state of physics in crisis at present time – too many Einstein believers with their antiquated "old" faith trying to block progress.

References

[1] http://www.hiltonratcliffe.com/Heresy.htm

[2] http://www.hollandsentinel.com/entertainment/x1616319221/Q-A-with-astrophysicist-Hilton-Ratcliffe

[3] First Crisis in Cosmology Conference Moncao, Portugal June 23 – 25 2005 By Hilton Ratcliffe

http://www.hiltonratcliffe.com/article007.htm

[4] Was Einstein a fake? by John Farrell, issue 11 Cosmos, October 2006
http://www.cosmosmagazine.com/node/1162

[5] Film: Carry on up the Jungle

c.RJAnderton10Jan2012