

# CHARLATAN MASTERPIECE

*(Experience of pseudo-scientific correspondence)*

Sekerin V.I.

November 9, 2007

About changing the content of programs and textbooks on physics for schools and universities.

Chairman of the Expert  
Commission of the  
Russian Academy of  
Sciences on the analysis  
and assessment of the  
scientific content of State  
educational standards and  
educational literature for  
higher and secondary  
schools

Academician V.V. Kozlov

Dear Valery Vasilievich!

In the book attached to the letter “Theory of relativity - a hoax of the twentieth century” on the basis of well-known astronomical observations and laboratory experiments, the falsehood of the postulate of the constancy of the speed of light  $c = \text{const}$  - the basis of the theory of relativity. Hence, it is proved that the theory of relativity itself is also a false theory. Further teaching of the theory of relativity in schools and universities is now a deliberate deception of schoolchildren and students, and the scientific research conducted on its basis is falsification.

The Commission headed by you should pay attention to this. It seems to me that you need to invite the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences to convene

a meeting at which to discuss the information received and recommend to the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation to stop teaching the theory of relativity in schools and universities, to make appropriate changes in programs, textbooks and teaching aids, and adjustments to scientific research.

V. I. Sekerin

Application:

1. The book "Theory of relativity - a hoax of the twentieth century."

(On the Internet: [http://koob.ru/sekerin\\_v\\_i/](http://koob.ru/sekerin_v_i/))

2. Review of the book "Theory of relativity - a hoax of the twentieth century"

Associate Professor, Ph.D. V.D. Chervenчук.

---

## *THE RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES*

03.25.08. No. 4-C-291-1851

*Sekerin V.I.*

*Novosibirsk*

*Dear Vladimir Ilyich!*

*In accordance with the decision of the expert group on physics of the Expert Commission of the Russian Academy of Sciences on the Analysis and Evaluation of the Scientific Content of State Educational Standards and Educational Literature for Higher and Secondary Schools, there are no grounds for excluding the section on the theory of relativity from textbooks.*

*Vice President of RAS*

*Academician V.V. Kozlov*

---

*Sekerin V.I.*

*07.04. 2008*

*About changing the content of programs and textbooks for schools and universities.*

*On your 25.03.2008 No. 4-C-291-1851*

*Вице-президенту РАН*

*Dear Valery Vasilievich!*

*It is in vain that you consider yourself not quite a full-fledged person, in vain. At school you were inspired by the teachers against their will and your wishes.*

*- You ask how I know this? - From your letter.*

*You write: "In accordance with the decision of the expert group on physics ... there is no reason to exclude the section on the theory of relativity from the textbooks."*

*You are the chairman of the Commission, whose experts have provided you with the text sent to me. And you, without delving into the essence of the matter, sign the letter.*

*You did not delve into it because you know from school time that the theory of relativity is not for the average mind, it is understood only by the gifted, and you at school did not understand the theory and came to terms with your limitations. You do not understand the theory now, therefore, in your letter you refer to experts.*

*- Don't you agree? - Let's check.*

*The key postulate of the theory of relativity is the postulate of the constancy of the speed of light  $c = \text{const}$  in the formulation of A. Einstein: "... one and the same light ray propagates in a vacuum with a speed "c" not only in the frame of reference  $K$ , but also in every other frame of reference  $K'$  moving uniformly and rectilinearly relative to  $K$ ". This formulation, with slight variations, without changing the meaning, is given in all textbooks.*

*- How should it be understood? - Literally! According to the postulate, when measuring the speed of light, its value, both from a stationary and from a moving source, or in a system moving relative to the source, should always be the same, the so-called "world constant", numerically equal to 299,793 km / sec.*

*A school textbook defines the word postulate: "A postulate in physical theory plays the same role as an axiom in mathematics. This is a basic proposition that*

cannot be logically proven. In physics, a postulate is the result of generalization of experimental facts”.

Here I must please you, in nature there is not, and there can be no experimental facts confirming the postulate  $c = \text{const.}$  - Don't you believe? - Look at textbooks, monographs, try experts.

On p. 14 - 20 of the book "Theory of relativity - a mystification of the twentieth century", attached to my last letter, a methodological analysis of measuring the speed of light is carried out in accordance with the observations of O. Römer in an inertial frame of reference moving relative to the source - the Earth. The speed of light on Earth from Jupiter's moon Io, continuously changing throughout the year, has been calculated. The speed of light obtained when measured according to the standard rules of physics is minimum – 299,763.2 km / s, maximum – 299,822.8 km / s, which significantly differ from the “world constant” proclaimed in the postulate  $c = \text{const.}$

These measurements show that the value of the relative speed of light can be much more or less than the one indicated in the postulate, it is not limited by anything, and **the “world constant”  $c = \text{const}$  is a figment of an unhealthy imagination!**

The misunderstanding of the theory of relativity by people with a normal education and ordinary everyday experience is due to their misunderstanding of the postulate, misunderstanding of its content, which denies the presence of the relative speed of light, which contradicts all previous experience of both man and mankind. The postulate is absurd, it not only has no experimental substantiation, but, on the contrary, is refuted by astronomical observations and laboratory experiments. Therefore, the postulate cannot be understood, it can only be taken on faith and remembered. And since the postulate is not understood, then its consequence, the theory of relativity, is also not understood, but taken on faith. Understanding and taking on faith are different concepts, understanding is the basis of science, faith is the lot of religion. Anyone who says he understands the theory of relativity is either disingenuous or lying.

So, don't be upset about your misunderstanding of the theory of relativity. This is a common phenomenon, compulsory study of theory instills in schoolchildren and students an inferiority complex that remains for life.

On the Internet on the website “For the Revival of Russian Science” on March 29 my article “A masterpiece of charlatans” was exhibited, the editors renamed it “Relativistic mystification of the 20th century”. It sets out in more detail the arguments about the inconsistency of the theory of relativity as a scientific theory. The article ends like this: **“Dear teachers of schools and universities!**

***Thoughtlessly retelling texts from textbooks on the topic "Theory of Relativity", you are deceiving young people, committing a crime. Don't be charlatans and charlatans' henchmen!"***

*If your experts are offended by this article and decide to demand compensation for moral damage in court, I recommend that they first make sure that "In physics, the postulate  $c = \text{const}$  is the result of generalizing experimental facts"?*

---

V.I Sekerin

### ***MASTERPIECE\* CHARLATANS\*\****

*A work, a product becomes a masterpiece, if it is recognized as such by the workshop masters.*

*For a century, part of the world's intellectual elite: philosophers and physicists, politicians and writers, academicians of all kinds of academies, both natural and humanitarian, laureates of the most prestigious prizes, etc., and so on, in a word, masters, claim that the theory of relativity (STO) an outstanding scientific achievement, it is the foundation on which the edifice of modern physics rests. They admire it themselves and do their best so that the rest of the world also looks at and admires this work. For the aforementioned category of masters, the new doctrine of space and time, the theory of relativity, is a masterpiece.*

*But on the other hand, for many it is quite obvious that a theory built on the false postulate of the constancy of the speed of light  $c = \text{const}$  is a false theory, it cannot reveal the laws of natural phenomena. The theory of relativity is a theological dogma, it is the basis of relativism - a subjective-idealistic doctrine that denies objective truth and the possibility of objective knowledge of the world, the basis of delusional scientific ideas developed by non-critically-minded researchers and a semi-literate, exalted public.*

*Therefore, for the slow-witted, we repeat in plain text: "part of the world's intellectual elite", "masters" are clergymen, and the central figure of relativism is "great" physicist A. Einstein, a successful plagiarist. The theory of relativity is a masterpiece of the charlatan's shop, a feeding trough for the accomplices of the author of the theory, as well as his involuntary accomplices \*\*\*.*

\* *Masterpiece - (French) exemplary work, the highest achievement of mastery; examination product for the title of master.*

\*\* *Charlatan - (it.) An impudent deceiver, a rogue; drug dealer.*

\*\*\* *An element of the charlatans' feeder is the construction and future operation of the LHC.*

*From the Internet. "The LHC is a Large Hadron Collider or LHC Large Hadron Collider, a powerful accelerator with colliding beams of elementary particles - protons, located in a tunnel that is a circle about 28 kilometers long. The tunnel is located at a depth of 50 to 150 meters under the Swiss-French border, near Geneva. The cost of building the collider is \$ 10 billion. 6500 scientists from 80 countries are taking part in the project under the auspices of the European Laboratory for Elementary Physics (CERN). This is almost half of all the specialists in the world dealing with elementary particle physics. The researchers hope that the LHC will help them recreate the conditions that existed immediately after the Big Bang and better understand how the universe was formed."*

---

*Some researchers express fears about a possible catastrophe when the accelerator is launched at CERN and received "Black Holes" on it.*

*Their fears are in vain. Instead of "Black holes", the next donut holes will be obtained.*

*A bit of background. More than twenty years ago, in a conversation with an academician, now deceased, director of the Institute of the Siberian Branch, I asked for assistance in publishing my first brochure. At first, I was promised support, but later, after several frank discussions, having dealt with the problem, the academician said: "I'm sorry, but I can't help you. You have no idea with what and who you are associating with, this is a world gang. I want to do some more work, but I advise you to stop your activities".*

*Approximately I have already introduced my opponents, however, I refused to follow the advice, which was followed by: "I wish you good luck, be careful!"*

*In 1988, I published a brochure "Essay on the Theory of Relativity", in which it was shown in a popular and polite form that the second postulate  $c = \text{const}$ , the basis of the theory of relativity, is refuted by astronomical observations and laboratory experiments. Consequently, the theory itself cannot describe the physical phenomena*

*of nature, that is, it is not scientific. The brochure did not go unnoticed; it was the subject of articles in Literaturnaya Gazeta and in the Nauka v Sibiri newspaper. They criticized the secondary provisions of the brochure, and the main reason for the failure of STO, the postulate  $c = \text{const}$ , was ignored.*

*It seemed to me that I did not clearly and understandably stated the problem, so I revised the text, took into account the shortcomings and remarks, and in 1991 published a brochure under the unambiguous title "Theory of relativity - the mystification of the century", in the annotation of which it is written: "The brochure contains experimental evidence correspondence of the speed of light to the classical law of addition of speeds, the inconsistency of the theory of relativity as a physical theory is shown, the philosophical essence and significance of this theory in studying and using it in practice are revealed.*

*Despite the discussion in the newspaper "Science in Siberia" on the topic of the brochure, which was attended by members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the hopes for the termination of teaching STO in schools and universities, how a hoax can be taught, again did not come true. For relativists - all this is "God's dew".*

*Last year, on the occasion of the anniversary of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, he went out of his way again and published the book "Theory of relativity - a mystification of the 20th century", in the final part of which it is written: "The theory of relativity is untenable as a physical theory. Consequently, its further teaching in schools and universities is a deliberate deception and leads to moral damage to pupils and students, and the continued funding of false research projects - to material losses of the state.*

*The accusation of deliberate deception directed to educational institutions and the Academy of Sciences, presumably, is a serious charge. In order for the book to be seen by officials who are obliged to stop deceiving, he tried to enter into correspondence. The first letter was sent to the President of the Russian Academy of Sciences Yu.S. Osipov. Later, letters were sent to the Chairman of the RAS Expert Commission for the Analysis and Evaluation of the Scientific Content of State Educational Standards and Educational Literature for Higher and Secondary Schools, Academician V.V. and the Chairman of the RAS Commission on Combating Pseudoscience and Falsification of Scientific Research Academician E.P. Kruglyakov.*

*I did not receive a reply from the President of the RAS Y.S. Osipov and the Chairman of CRANBLIF. From the Ministry of Education and Science, in response to my letter to the Minister of the Russian Federation A.A. Fursenko, instead of making the proposed changes to the programs of schools and universities, the employee of the Ministry sent V. G. Drozhenko Conclusions from the Joint Institute for Nuclear*



*Research, Dubna, and the Institute of Nuclear research, Moscow, on the content of the book sent.*

*After receiving the Conclusion of Academician V.A.Rubakov and my objections sent by me to Rosnauk in the form of V.D. : “The RAS decides, we cannot do anything else”.*

*The correspondence has ended. I bring it to your attention.*

---

*Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation*

*A.A. Fursenko*

*Dear Andrey Alekseevich!*

*In April of this year, I sent a letter to the President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician Yu.S. Osipov with the following content.*

*“In the attached to this letter my book “ The theory of relativity - a mystification of the twentieth century ”and the work of SA Bazilevsky and MP Varin“ Einstein's error ”included in it, the inconsistency of the theory of relativity as a physical theory is argued. Therefore, it is necessary to stop teaching it in schools and universities, and to include in the textbooks a full description of astronomical observations by O. Römer, D. Bradley and the conclusions from them.*

*I understand your difficulties in this event. I remember our short conversation ten years ago, when you said that you agree with the need to stop teaching, but you can do nothing. But further teaching of the theory of relativity becomes a crime. Pupils and students of the country are misled, moral damage is caused to them, and the financing of false scientific research works leads to unjustified material losses of the state.*

*I hope that you will take appropriate measures to correct the abnormal situation on this issue in science and education and overcome resistance, because not only relativists are at the Academy. For example, in July 2006*

*Academician Samvel Samvelovich Grigoryan agreed to be the editor of the book sent to you. A sudden serious illness prevented him from fulfilling our agreement.*

*Most of the members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, presumably, have no interest in continuing the deception.*

*Sanity and decency must prevail."*

*Unfortunately, I have not received an answer. Probably, the situation for Yu.S. Osipov has not changed over the past time in this matter. And the problem must be solved.*

*You are a physicist by education, therefore, I hope, you will objectively understand the problem and, together with the President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, correct the situation.*

*June 20, 2007 V. I. Sekerin*

*Appendix: the book "Theory of relativity - a hoax of the twentieth century"*

*(In the Internet: [http://koob.ru/sekerin\\_v\\_i/](http://koob.ru/sekerin_v_i/))*

---

*Federal agency on Science and Innovation*

*422pg-fani 389*

*September 14, 2007*

*V.I. SEKERIN*

*630090*

*Novosibirsk*

*Dear Vladimir Ilyich!*

*We are sending you the conclusion of the senior researcher of the Laboratory of Theoretical Physics. DI Blokhintsev of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research of AB Pestov for the brochure “Theory of relativity - a hoax of the 20th century”.*

*Appendix 2 p.*

*Deputy Head of Department V.G. Drozhenko*

---

*JOINT INSTITUTE FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH*

*Dubna, Moscow region, Russia*

*№ 002-04/447II*

*06.09.07*

*Deputy Head of Department  
development of exploratory research and  
new technologies  
Federal agency  
on Science and Innovation  
V. G. DROZHENKO*

*On your ref. 329pg-fani-389*

From 24.04.07

Dear Vladimir Georgievich!

*I am sending you the conclusion of a senior researcher at the Laboratory of Theoretical Physics. DI Blokhintsev A.B. Pestov on the brochure of VI Sekerin "Theory of relativity - a hoax of the 20th century".*

*Since research in the field of the theory of relativity is not specialized for JINR, this conclusion is a private opinion of the scientist.*

*Appendix: Conclusion on 1 sheet and V. I. Sekerin's brochure*

*The Chief Scientific Secretary of the Institute N.A. Rusakovich*

---

07-сех-2007

## CONCLUSION

*To V. I. Sekerin's brochure*

*"The theory of relativity - a hoax of the twentieth century"*

*Relativity has a precise mathematical representation as either the Galileo group or the Poincaré group. These groups belong to the class of Lie groups, the theory of which has been developed very deeply. The components of the relative motion velocity are group parameters of the considered groups of space-time symmetry. The law of addition of velocities is determined by the Lie algebra of the Galilean group or the Poincaré group. In the second case, the speed of light is an absolute scale in the space of speeds (from a geometric point of view, the Lobachevsky constant). The Lobachevsky geometry and the Poincaré group are here sides of the same coin. To deny Einstein's relativity (Poincaré group) is to deny Lobachevsky's geometry.*

*The conclusion is that this work has nothing to do with either the deployment of exploratory research or the creation of new technologies.*

*Art. Researcher, BLTP, JINR*

*Pestov A.B.*

---



*Federal Agency for Science and Innovation*

---

*Department of Development of Exploratory Research and New Technologies*

*Tverskaya st., 11, building 1*

*Moscow, 125009*

*Phone: 629-65-94*

*No, 01-07 from 11.01.2008*

*V. I. SEKERIN*

*Novosibirsk*

*Dear Vladimir Ilyich!*

*The Department for the Development of Exploratory Research and New Technologies sends the conclusion of Academician V.A. Rubakov. to your brochure "Theory of Relativity - Mystification of the XX century" sent to Rosnauka from the Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences.*

*Application: 5 liters.*

*Deputy Head of the Department V.G. Drozhenko*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'V.G. Drozhenko', with the initials 'B.F.' written in small letters to the right of the signature.

---

## CONCLUSION

*to the brochure V.I. Sekerin*

*"The theory of relativity - a hoax of the XX century".*

*The main thesis of the first part of the brochure (Chapters 1-4) is the author's assertion that the classical, nonrelativistic law of addition of velocities is valid at any speeds and, accordingly, that the speed of light is not constant. The author uses the result of observations by O. Römer as the main proof. However, the most adequate interpretation of this result does not use the law of addition of velocities and has a purely kinematic character. In a linear order with respect to the ratio  $v/c$  of the Earth's speed to the speed of light, the apparent orbital period is the same in the classical and relativistic theory.*

*Let's dwell on this point in more detail. Let a light signal be emitted from the satellite Io at some moment (for example, when it is closest to the Earth), and after one orbital period  $T$ , a second signal is emitted. Let us ask ourselves the question: what is the time interval between observations of these two signals on Earth? It is this period of time that will be the visible period of circulation. Neglecting corrections of the order of  $v^2/c^2$ , the effect both in the theory of relativity and in classical mechanics is reduced to the following. We will work in the frame of reference associated with Jupiter. Ground in position II in fig. Brochure 4 is moving away from Jupiter / Io with speed  $v$ . In time  $T$ , it will move away from Jupiter / Io at a distance  $vT$ , so the second signal will take additional time to reach Earth*

$$\Delta T = \frac{vT}{c}$$

*compared to the first signal. Thus, the apparent orbital period for the Earth in position II is*

$$T_2 = T + \Delta T = T + \frac{vT}{c}$$

*For Earth in position IV, the distance to Jupiter decreases over time, and the effect is reversed:*

$$T_4 = T - \frac{vT}{c}$$

*In positions I and III, the projection of the Earth's speed to the direction of Jupiter is zero, and there is no effect:*

$$T_1 = T_3 = T$$

*All this exactly corresponds to the observations and formula (14) of the brochure.*

*In this elementary analysis, the law of addition of velocities is not used in any way, it is valid both in the theory of relativity and in classical mechanics (neglecting corrections of the order of  $v^2/c^2$ ), so Römer's result does not testify either for or against the theory of relativity. Corrections of the order  $v^2/c^2$  to the above formulas*

are available both in classical mechanics and in the theory of relativity, while they are different in these two theories. However, these amendments are so small that they could not be detected not only in the 17th century, but also later.

Based on classical mechanics, the author provides an analysis of the situation in the reference frame related to the Earth. Such an analysis can indeed be formulated in such a way that the nonrelativistic law of addition of velocities plays an essential role in it. However, the author does not bother to carry out a relativistic analysis in the Earth's frame of reference. If he did this, he would get exactly the same result (neglecting corrections of the order of  $v^2/c^2$ ).

What has been said above clearly enough characterizes the level of the brochure: the author does not want (or cannot) carry out a comprehensive analysis of the key, from his point of view, observational fact and without any reason asserts that the results of Section 4.1 "confirm the classical law of addition of velocities for light"

...

I will cite a few more examples that prove the brochure's failure. The author's level of theoretical training is characterized by his statement on page 46, section 6.3 that "the kinetic energy of the accelerated particle is limited by the limit  $E - mc^2/2$ ". The author does not even notice that here he contradicts himself. Indeed, if we accept the author's point of view that the classical law of addition of velocities is valid at all speeds, and also take into account the principle of relativity (on which the author insists, Chapter 5), then the expression for the kinetic energy at all speeds is uniquely determined and has the form

$$E = \frac{mv^2}{2}$$

I do not give the proof of the last statement, a high school student is able to fulfill it. This kinetic energy is not limited by anything (especially if we take into account that the author admits superluminal velocities - for example, he talks about the velocities of mesons  $v = 10^4c$  in Section 6.1).

In general, Section 6.3, where the author declares that the theory of the acceleration of charged particles is based on "the acceleration of charged particles in controlled electric and magnetic fields, which is inexplicable in modern physical concepts," is especially indicative. The author, judging by other places in the brochure, is (or was) related to the Institute of Nuclear Physics. Budker SB RAS, and I could ask, on the basis of what theory, calculations of accelerators in this scientific



center are performed. Answer: based on the special theory of relativity, classical and quantum electrodynamics. These theories perfectly describe everything, even the most subtle effects in accelerator physics.

In Section 6.1, the author pretends that the change in the lifetime of moving elementary particles has not been verified by laboratory experiments, citing a quote from M. Born's book published in the USSR in 1973: "... Artificial mesons move relatively slowly and their lifetime is practically close to time the life of resting mesons. " In our time, this is far from the case: "artificial mesons" in many accelerator experiments move at speeds that are quite a bit lower than the speed of light. The effect of lengthening their life has been reliably verified by experiment. Moreover, this effect, of course, is taken into account when designing accelerator experiments in which decays of mesons and other elementary particles are studied: the greater the energy of the decaying particles, the longer the decay volume is needed, and the corresponding dependence is exactly given by the theory of relativity. Let me note that in a number of experiments the velocities of these particles are also measured (by the time-of-flight method, that is, just by the method on which the author of the brochure insists), and they never exceed the speed of light. All that has been said applies to cosmic muons (more precisely, muons of cosmic rays; for the author of the brochure: mu-mesons according to the old nomenclature); in particular, the time-of-flight technique for measuring the velocity of these unstable particles has been implemented at the Underground Scintillation Telescope of the Baksan Neutrino Observatory, INR RAS. For reference: the lifetime of a muon at rest is  $\tau = 2.2 \cdot 10^{-6}$  s, the fluxes of muons of various energies under the conditions of the Baksan Neutrino Observatory of the INR RAS agree with the calculation based on the theory of relativity with an accuracy of no worse than 20% (the uncertainties in the calculation are associated with uncertainties in the fluxes primary cosmic rays); the muon velocities measured from the time of flight are equal to  $c$  within the experimental error, which is not higher than 10% - a contradiction with the independence of the lifetime on velocity is obvious.

The author is generally at odds with experiments and observations. He does not know most of them - and after all, over the past 40 years, many experiments have been carried out to test the special and general theory of relativity at a high level of accuracy, quantitatively confirming the predicted relativistic effects, and still have not found deviations from the predictions of these theories. For an overview of experimental searches for deviations from the predictions of special and general relativity, see *Modern tests of Lorentz in-variance*. David Mattingly. Published in *Living Rev. Rel.* 8: 5,2005. Internet resource:

e-Print: [gr-qc/0502097](http://arxiv.org/abs/gr-qc/0502097).

*He often simply dismisses the experimental results known to the author. An example is the measurement of the deflection of a ray in the gravitational field of the sun, which confirms the general theory of relativity. Of course, the effect of the matter surrounding the Sun, which the author cites as an alternative explanation for the deflection of a ray of light, is well known. It is also known that it is small in comparison with the effect of general relativity. However, instead of studying the relevant literature, the author unceremoniously discards the observational results. I will add that the effect of gravitational lensing of light is known, besides the Sun, for a number of classes of objects; in particular, it is successfully used for observational measurement of the mass distribution in galaxy clusters. Without even delving into the special literature, numerous examples of observed gravitational lenses can be found on the Internet. There is no doubt that light is deflected by gravitational fields, and that this deflection, within the experimental error, is consistent with general relativity.*

*I think that the given examples are enough to give an unambiguous conclusion about the failure of the brochure. However, it is worth dwelling on Appendix 1, which the author uses as a proof of the statement that Maxwell's equations "in systems inertially moving one relative to another ... have a different form." Appendix 1 is a material by S.A. Bazilevsky and M.P. Varina "Einstein's Error". In it, in particular, the authors propose, instead of Maxwell's equations, to consider the equations*

$$\text{rot}\vec{E} = -\frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\partial \vec{B}}{\partial t} + (\vec{c} \cdot \vec{\nabla})\vec{B} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{rot}\vec{B} = \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{\partial \vec{E}}{\partial t} + (\vec{c} \cdot \vec{\nabla})\vec{E} \quad (2)$$

*Where  $\sigma$  — "constant, numerically equal to the speed of light in a void relative to its source" (to reduce the formulas, the term with the current is not written out, the designations are simplified compared to the original text). Here is the "speed of light relative to the source" introduced by the authors. Further, the authors argue that in a frame of reference moving with a speed  $v$  relative to the one where equations (1) and (2) are satisfied, the equations of electrodynamics have the form (1), (2) with the replacement of  $c$  by  $c - v$ . The authors do not analyze in any way the experimental manifestations of such a cardinal modification of electrodynamics and do not try to present solutions to the new system of equations. They do not even notice that one of the properties of system (1), (2) is that a static inhomogeneous magnetic field generates an electric field and vice versa, in gross contradiction with ordinary electrodynamics and experiment.*

*Moreover, this modification is logically inconsistent. First, the direction of the vector  $c$  is not indicated. If for a point source this direction could be the direction to*

*the source, then for an extended source or several sources no selected direction can be determined. Further, it is impossible to determine the value of  $c$  for several sources moving relative to each other. In general, the material in Appendix 1 is completely meaningless and illiterate, which is an additional characteristic of this brochure.*

*In conclusion, a general consideration. Of course, no one said that the existing theories, including special and general relativity, the theory of elementary particles, etc., are "the ultimate truths." However, when trying to go beyond these theories, be it attempts to construct alternative theories or attempts to "correct" existing ones, it should be borne in mind that the existing theories are confirmed (of course, with a certain accuracy) by a large body of experimental data. In conclusion, a general consideration. Of course, no one said that the existing theories, including special and general relativity, the theory of elementary particles, etc., are "the ultimate truths." However, when trying to go beyond these theories, be it attempts to construct alternative theories or attempts to "correct" existing ones, it should be borne in mind that the existing theories are confirmed (of course, with a certain accuracy) by a large body of experimental data. Material from the brochure by V.I. Sekerin's "Theory of Relativity - a mystification of the XX century" does not satisfy this criterion in any way.*

*The credibility of the authorship of Academician V.A.Rubakov is certified by the signature of V.G. Drozhenko.*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'V.G. Drozhenko', written in a cursive style. The signature is located below the text and above a horizontal line.

---

## **REVIEW**

*on the book by V.I. Sekerin "Theory of relativity - a hoax of the twentieth century",*

Novosibirsk, Art Avenue, 2007.-- 128 p.

*The book is written in a simple language accessible to schoolchildren, it is a necessary help for school teachers and university teachers in the disciplines "Physics" and "Astronomy". It is difficult for any honest physicist to disagree with the arguments of its author, exposing the largest sabotage in the history of science in the field of theoretical physics - the special theory of relativity (SRT). The author of the book gives a scientifically substantiated answer to the question: "Is the  $c = \text{const}$  postulate a figment of fantasy, or a natural phenomenon?" And this answer is quite unambiguous - a figment of fantasy, which has nothing to do with physical science!*

*Henri Poincaré, who was the first to put forward the "postulate" of the independence of the speed of light from the speed of its source (for the sake of saving the "theory of ether" after Michelson's experiment, which gave a negative result), was convinced that under terrestrial conditions it was impossible to create an installation for experimental verification of this "postulate" ... However, such an installation was created by nature itself - the orbit of the Earth and the satellite of Jupiter Io. Periodic changes in the period of Io's revolution around Jupiter, associated with the orbital motion of the Earth, observed and described by O. Römer in the 17th century, is an experimental refutation of this, absurd in its content, "postulate".*

*The merit of Vladimir Ilyich Sekerin lies in the fact that in his book he gives a fairly simple explanation, accessible even to schoolchildren, for this experiment. In schools where there is a telescope, Römer's observations are easy to repeat and once again make sure that the "postulate"  $c = \text{const}$  is incorrect and that the classical rule of addition of velocities for the speed of light is applicable.*

*The book also explains very simply the transverse Doppler (Römer) effect. And then all the other "circumstantial evidence" of the presence of relativistic effects and the "refutation" of the classical rule of velocity addition (de Sitter's observations of binary stars, Venus radar, the lifetime of  $\pi$ -mesons, the deflection of a light ray in a gravitational field, etc.) are consistently exposed. ).*

*Further, the author clearly showed that the methodological basis of SRT is subjective idealism, revealed the "technology" of SRT invention, comparing it with the preparation of an application for an invention of a former employee of the patent office.*

*The unfair reviews of V.I.'s opponents lead to gloomy thoughts. Sekerin, which are given in the book. What are they? Do they not understand that these ridiculous*

*statements about his book fully reveal their true face? And no academic titles and degrees will save them from shame! About the nonsense that they deigned to weave, it is even unnecessary to say. Everything is clear anyway, no comment.*

*I will repeat myself. The book is very useful and should be in demand in science and education. It is time to end with the mockery of common sense and deliberate deception of students and schoolchildren, the practice of all sorts of opportunists trying to teach others what they themselves do not understand. How long can you endure it?*

*Associate Professor, Ph.D. V.D. Chervenчук*

*Signature V.D. Chervenчук*

*I assure early. HR department 09.10.07*

---

## **COMMENTS**

*to the obtained Conclusions senior researcher A.B.Pestov and academician V.A.Rubakov on the brochure by V.I.Sekerin "Theory of relativity - a hoax of the 20th century"*

*Conclusions of the senior researcher A.B.Pestov and academician V.A.Rubakov do not refute the justification for the implementation of the proposal to stop teaching in schools and universities the false theory of relativity. Whereas the Review of Associate Professor V.D. Chervenчук confirms this need.*

*First Conclusion Art. Researcher at BLTP JINR A.B. Pestov is a description of the mathematical formalism used in the presentation of the theory of relativity, supported by a kind of logic, according to the proverb: "There is an elder in the garden, and there is an uncle in Kiev." However, this Conclusion cannot be taken seriously, because the incompetence of A.B.Pestov was confirmed by the Chief Scientist Secretary of the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research N.A. Rusakovich, who wrote in an accompanying letter: "Since research in the field of the theory of relativity is not core to JINR, this conclusion is the private opinion of the scientist. "*

*Frank confession of N.A. Rusakovich. Academician LM Barkov, for example, writes: "atomic and nuclear physics, physics of elementary particles ... are inconceivable without Einstein's special theory of relativity." And for JINR, it turns*

out, “research in the field of the theory of relativity is not profile”. I wonder what the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research is doing?

The conclusion of Academician V.A. Rubakov is closer to the topic, however, of the same type as the first, and the negative conclusion about the brochure in it: “Material of the brochure by V.I. S. does not satisfy in any way”, is not confirmed by arguments.

Disputing the main thesis of the brochure about the lack of constancy of the speed of light, VA Rubakov writes: “As the main proof, the author uses the result of O. Römer's observations. However, the most adequate interpretation of this result does not use the law of addition of velocities and has a purely kinematic character. In a linear order with respect to the ratio  $v/c$  of the Earth's speed to the speed of light, the apparent orbital period is the same in the classical and relativistic theory.

Analyzing the change in the duration of the Io period observed on Earth, but in the reference system associated with Jupiter, and solving here the problem with consideration of the separate motion of the Earth and the movement of light, where it is possible to indirectly bypass, not to mention the law of addition of velocities, V.A. Rubakov sums up: “All this exactly corresponds to the observations and formula (14) of the brochure.

In this elementary analysis, the law of addition of velocities is not used in any way; it is valid both in the theory of relativity and in classical mechanics (neglecting corrections of the order  $v^2/c^2$ ), therefore, Römer's result does not testify either for or against the theory of relativity”. (Emphasized by me. V.S.).

Let us compare V.A. Rubakov's conclusion with the text of the brochure. On p. 10 the postulate  $c = \text{const}$  is quoted in the formulation of A. Einstein: “... one and the same light ray propagates in a void with a speed “ $c$ ” not only in the frame of reference  $K$ , but also in every other frame of reference  $K'$ , moving uniformly and rectilinear with respect to  $K$ ”.

- How should it be understood?

- Literally! According to the postulate, when measuring the speed of light, its value, both from a stationary and from a moving source, or in a system moving relative to the source, must always be the same, the so-called “world constant”, equal to 299 793 km / sec.

Further, on p.14 - p.20 of the brochure, a methodological analysis of measuring the speed of light is carried out in accordance with the observations of O.

*Römer in an inertial reference system moving relative to the source - the Earth, the speed of light on Earth from Jupiter's satellite Io, continuously changing throughout the year, is calculated. The speed of light obtained when measured according to the standard rules of physics is minimum - 299 763.2 km / s, maximum - 299 822.8 km / s, which significantly differ from the “world constant” proclaimed in the postulate  $c = \text{const}$ .*

*These measurements show that the value of the relative speed of light can be much more or less than that indicated in the postulate, it is not limited by anything, and the “world constant”  $c = \text{const}$  is a **figment of an unhealthy imagination!***

*- So do O. Römer's result testify against the  $c = \text{const}$  postulate and, therefore, against the theory of relativity ?!*

*- Yes, it certainly does!*

*More direct, visual and reliable evidence of the lack of constancy of the speed of light, and, consequently, the inconsistency of the theory of relativity is difficult to think of!*

*And more questions: “What numbers for the signal speed should be set when determining the location of space satellites in their flights to the planets of the solar system? What numbers should we recommend to other space navigation systems for the speed of electromagnetic radiation: “world constant”  $c = \text{const}$ , or relative classical ones? ”*

*For example, two artificial satellites move at the same speed around Mars in the plane of the Earth's location, the first clockwise, the second counterclockwise. At the moment of the minimum distance between them and the maximum speed of the first from the Earth, and the second - to the Earth, both satellites simultaneously emit a short pulse of light towards the Earth. The type of emitters (lasers) and the pulse duration are the same.*

*Will pulses of light arrive at the same time to an observer on Earth?*

*Is it possible on Earth to determine which satellite emitted each pulse?*

*Finding the correct answers to these and similar questions is the main topic of the book under discussion. But this is precisely what VA Rubakov “does not see”. The obvious contradiction between the postulate and the obtained variable relative speed of light not only in the observations of O. Römer, but also in subsequent examples, he replaces by considering the change in the duration of Io's period in the classical and relativistic versions and concludes: “Based on classical mechanics, the author*

*analyzes the situation in the frame of reference associated with the Earth. Such an analysis can indeed be formulated in such a way that the nonrelativistic law of addition of velocities plays an essential role in it. However, the author does not bother to carry out a relativistic analysis in the Earth's frame of reference. If he did, he would get exactly the same result (neglecting corrections of the order  $v^2/c^2$ ).*

*The question arises, why carry out a comparative analysis, if, as a result, an experimentally alternative is not solvable between the relativistic and classical approaches, it is written about this somewhat higher in the text: "However, these corrections are so small that they could not be detected not only in the 17th century, but also later"?*

*We have no right to suspect the academician's illiteracy, there is only one answer, the analysis of the change in the duration of the Io period is a forgery, it is necessary to divert the discussion from the main problem of the book - clear and experimentally proven decisions about the inconsistency of the  $c = \text{const}$  postulate on the field of fruitless speculation.*

*VA Rubakov "does not notice" and the statements on p. 78 brochures that "the second postulate has no experiments to confirm it." "Doesn't notice" for a simple reason: there are no experiments and observations that he can present.*

*Conclusions of the senior researcher A.B. Pestov and academician V.A. Rubakov are very similar to previously published articles and reviews of relativists on this topic, they all use the same widely known technique, discuss, refute and prove anything, but not "World constant" - the postulate  $c = \text{const}$ . It is impossible to directly refute the calculations of the relative speed of light by O. Römer and D. Bradley, you have to "distort the cards".*

*It makes no sense to analyze the rest of the text of the Conclusion of Academician V.A. Rubakov, it contains conclusions from the false postulate  $c = \text{const}$ , therefore they are also false.*

*After showing the inconsistency of the postulate  $c = \text{const}$ , what are the odes of praise in honor of STO look like?*

*The Conclusions on the brochure, demanded by the Ministry of Education and Science from the Russian Academy of Sciences, are a verification of the accuracy of the information contained in it. Let us recall them briefly.*

*If we agree to consider the postulate  $c = \text{const}$  as a description of a natural phenomenon, then after that it is not possible to prove logically and mathematically*



*the falsity of the theory of relativity itself, for all its paradoxicality. The falsity of the theory of relativity is proved only through the proof of the falsity of the postulate  $c = \text{const}$ , which is done in the brochure.*

*In the article “The Lies of Ideologists” the well-known publicist and scientist SG Kara-Murza writes: “... for a scientist, the norm is to report only what he considers reliable, regardless of the “usefulness of the case”. Scientist errors are possible, but a lie is unacceptable. In science, an employee who rigged data is instantly kicked out. In economics, norms are softer, but here, too, lies are unacceptable. If the liar is not sanctioned, the community falls apart.”*

*Yes, indeed, if the liar is not sanctioned, the scientific community disintegrates. But a normal community is disintegrating, and if it is a community of liars, then it does not disintegrate, but flourishes, as the so-called “scientific” community of relativistic physicists, followers of the “outstanding” scientist of the 20th century A. Einstein and propagandists of his creation - the theory relativity.*

*Despite the advertised cliché about “complexity, and in this regard, the inaccessibility of understanding by ordinary mortals of the theory of relativity,” in fact, this creation is simpler than an empty eggshell.*

*At the beginning of the twentieth century, scientists around the world came to a dead end in the study of electromagnetic radiation, and its component of light. The prevailing ideas about the nature of light as waves of a special medium - ether, were in clear contradiction with astronomical observations and laboratory experiments. Waves are observed, registered, but the medium itself-ether cannot be detected in any way. All sorts of assumptions, up to the revision of the ideas of space, time and mass, unshakable until now, did not give an experimentally non-contradictory picture of the world.*

*In 1905, A. Einstein published an article in which he formulated the fundamental invention, the above-quoted postulate, and the consequences from it, now called the theory of relativity.*

*The misunderstanding of the theory of relativity by people with a normal education and ordinary everyday experience is due to their misunderstanding of the postulate, misunderstanding of its content, which denies the presence of the relative speed of light, which contradicts all previous experience of both man and mankind. The postulate is absurd, it not only has no experimental substantiation, but, on the contrary, is refuted by astronomical observations and laboratory experiments. Therefore, the postulate cannot be understood, it can only be taken on faith and remembered.*

*And since the postulate is not understood, then its consequences - the theory of relativity - are also not understood, but taken on trust. Understanding and acceptance on faith are different concepts, understanding is the prerogative of science, faith is the lot of religion. Anyone who says he understands the theory of relativity is either disingenuous or lying.*

*Do relativists know about this?*

*They know, but their behavior is compared to the tailors from Andersen's fairy tale about the naked king, like the behavior of highway robbers with the behavior of children from kindergarten. Tailors deceived volunteers, relativists enforce lies en masse.*

*Textbook "Physics", grade 11, authors G.Ya. Myakishev and B.B. Bukhovtsev, recommended by the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation for educational institutions, 15th edition, Moscow, "Education" 2006, p. 238, the formulation of the postulate: "The speed of light in vacuum is the same for all inertial reference frames. It does not depend on the speed of the source, nor on the speed of the receiver of the light signal".*

*On the previous page the definition of the word "postulate" is given: "A postulate in physical theory plays the same role as an axiom in mathematics. This is a basic proposition that cannot be logically proven. In physics, a postulate is the result of generalization of experimental facts".*

*But there are no experimental facts in nature, the generalization of which confirms the independence of the speed of light from the movement of the source or receiver. Therefore, the content of the postulate  $c = \text{const}$  is a blatant lie imposed by relativists on the world community, as well as the excellent "dress of the king" drawn by them on the basis of the postulate - the theory of relativity.*

*More than two hundred years before A. Einstein, the Danish astronomer O. Römer, while searching for a space "clock", noticed an interesting phenomenon, a periodic change in the duration of the period of Jupiter's moon Io. O. Römer revealed the nature of this phenomenon and for the first time in the world calculated the value of the speed of light. The change in the duration of Io's periods is based on the change in the speed of light in the Earth's system. Calculation of the relative speed of light in the Earth's system shows that it changes by plus or minus 29.8 km / sec, and is not limited by anything. Half a century after O. Römer, the English astronomer D. Bradley discovered the phenomenon of stellar aberration, the nature of which is also due to a change in the relative speed of light of stars in the Earth's system.*

*The classical law of addition of velocities for light is confirmed not only by these observations, but also by later laboratory experiments, which are described in the brochure under discussion.*

*Received Conclusions Art. Researcher at BLTP JINR A.B. Pestov and Academician V.A.Rubakov, as well as previously obtained ones, do not confirm the reliability of the postulate  $c = \text{const}$ . The objections given in them against the evidence of the falsehood of the postulate presented in the brochure are indirect, not in essence, they are unfounded, without facts and calculations. Thus, the authors of the Conclusions actually agree with the inconsistency of the theory of relativity as a physical theory. Consequently, the proposal to exclude the theory of relativity from the programs of schools and universities should be implemented by the Ministry of Education and Science as soon as possible, because the content of the postulate  $c = \text{const}$  in school and university textbooks is a lie.*

*A lie in teaching cripples the psyche and teachers, a lie in science interferes with the knowledge of nature, a lie in technology causes material damage.*

*Dear teachers of schools and universities!*

***Thoughtlessly retelling texts from textbooks on the topic "Theory of Relativity", you are deceiving young people, committing a crime.***

***Do not be charlatans and charlatans' henchmen!***

*V. I. Sekerin*

*Installation date: 09/06/2008*

***W***



Russian to English translation using Google Translate by Thomas E Miles. Original Russian language files located at: <http://www.ritz-btr.narod.ru/>. Other Ritz related files located at the Robert Fritzius web site: <http://shadetreephysics.com/>