

Relativity revival reinstates Newtonian physics

Roger J Anderton

R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

There is an elite in academia that has revised Einsteinian relativity and returned to Newtonian physics. This has not been explicitly stated that such a revision has occurred so leaving most of academia blundering away with the same old path of mistakes that Einstein has set them on.

According to Steve Nerlich an amateur Australian astronomer, publisher of the Cheap Astronomy website [1] who is going by Schutz [2] director and head of the astrophysics group at the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics in Potsdam, Germany [3]:

“Einstein’s general relativity theory, after an initial buzz in the 1920s, sat in the obscurity of backroom physics through the 1930s and up to the mid 1950s. Indeed, as an example of the maxim that you often have to wait for someone to die before the science can move on, it is claimed that only after Einstein’s death in 1955 did something of a revival take place, which then brought relativity physics back into the mainstream.”

So we have a lot of resistance against Einstein's relativity from 1919 onwards as described by i.e. Mueller Project, [4] then after Einstein died there was a revival of Einstein's relativity in mainstream academia.

Nerlich says:

“The author Bernard Schutz can claim some authority here since his thesis supervisor was Kip Thorne whose thesis supervisor was John A Wheeler. Wheeler, quoting from his Wikipedia write up was *an American theoretical physicist who was largely responsible for reviving interest in general relativity in the United States after World War II*. And according to Kip Thorne’s Wikipedia write up, Thorne is *one of the world’s leading experts on the astrophysical implications of Einstein’s general theory of relativity*. Bernard F Schutz’s Wikipedia write up just says he *is an American physicist*, but give him time.”

So bear this name “Kip Thorne” in mind a moment, a supposed expert on Einstein's relativity.

Now I would like to refer to what Peter M. Brown has to say [5] :

“two different interpretations of general relativity. Therefore, for reasons of clarity, Einstein’s vision of general relativity, as defined in *The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity* and other publications, will be referred to as EGR (*Einstein’s General Relativity*). General relativity as to it is widely understood at present will be referred to as MGR (*Modern General Relativity*).”

So there's two different versions of general relativity.

Now let's hop back to this Kip Thorne, if we go to wikipedia [6] it makes out a long list of impressive things about him:

"American theoretical physicist, known for his prolific contributions in gravitation physics and astrophysics and for having trained a generation of scientists. A longtime friend and colleague of Stephen Hawking and Carl Sagan, he was the Feynman Professor of Theoretical Physics at the California Institute of Technology (Caltech) “

Wikipedia goes on to say:

“In 1994, he [Thorne] published 'Black Holes and Time Warps: Einstein's Outrageous Legacy', a landmark book for non-scientists for which he received numerous awards. “

Brown quotes Thorne from this book [7]:

“As stated by Thorne *space-time curvature* and tidal gravity are the same thing expressed in different languages, the former in the language of relativity, the later in the language of Newtonian gravity.”

So according to Thorne – general relativity is Newtonian physics but using a different language. But that is his revision, not the original due to Einstein.

Let's now go through the steps if you missed them:

1. Einstein famous in 1919 with his theory of general relativity meets in his lifetime a great deal of resistance from academia opposing acceptance of that theory.
2. Einstein dies and general relativity is revived in academia- the main man being Kip Thorne.
3. The revived theory is not the same theory as what Einstein was talking about as noted by Brown.
4. Thorne's reintroduction of general relativity – now has revised general relativity as being the same as Newtonian physics, only now its using a different language. .

Conclusion

There is an elite in academia that has now abandoned Einstein's relativity (in its original form) but won't explicitly state that, and so leaves everything in a mess. The elite still wants to have the false front of presenting Einstein as a mega genius overturning Newtonian physics. But the truth is those “in the know” abandoned Einstein's relativity by stealth and returned to Newtonian physics but seeking to hide all that in a complicated language. “THEY” don't care that nonsense is still being taught physics students, because “THEY” in the elite don't believe that nonsense themselves.

Further information dealt with in other articles such as – how Newtonian physics can be recovered from correcting Einstein's mistakes with special relativity; the reasons for the mess being due to Einstein bad at maths and making numerous other mistakes etc. Einstein being promoted as iconic hero has made it enforced dogma for mainstream to stick with many of those mistakes, hence why this elite who know its Einsteinian nonsense do a revision by stealth.

In other words a smokescreen has been set up in academia to divert large portions of the scientific community and interested laypersons into believing nonsense as regards Einstein's physics which this elite does not believe.

References

[1] <http://www.universetoday.com/94312/journal-club-black-holes-made-all-the-difference/>

[2] Thoughts about a conceptual framework for relativistic gravity, [Bernard F. Schutz](#),
<http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.3090>

[3] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bernard_F._Schutz wiki at 26 march 2012

[4] 95 Years of Criticism of the Special Theory of Relativity (1908-2003)
The G. O. Mueller Research Project,
<http://www.ekkehard-friebe.de/95yearsrelativity.pdf>

[5] Einstein's gravitational field Peter M. Brown
<http://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0204044>

[6] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kip_Thorne
wiki at 26 March 2012

[7] *Black Holes & Time Warps*, Kip S. Thorne, (W.W. Norton, 1994), pp. 111

c.RJAnderton2012