

Einstein, Hero or Villain?

by

Javier de Juan Díaz

Relativity is being very much discussed and disapproved by many. It is curious that Einstein received the Nobel Prize of Physics in 1921, that is to say 16 years after The Special Theory of Relativity was made known, according to the literal words of the concession: "for services to Theoretical Physics and especially for his discovery of the photoelectric effect". Relativity was not mentioned. Only in the presentation discourse, read by Professor S. Arrhenius, President of the Physics Nobel Prize Committee, Relativity had been mentioned just to say that it couldn't be a Theory totally accepted. Einstein, in his acceptance speech, didn't mention the photoelectric effect, main motive of the concession. The whole discourse was dedicated to the Theory of Relativity and this was its title: "Fundamental ideas and problems of the Theory of Relativity". This shows his disagreement with the motive for the prize concession or, rather, his complaint against his main Theory not being accepted. Nevertheless, he took the corresponding 40.000 \$. It was much more money than he had had in all his life. Einstein, 42 years old in 1921, was one of the most famous personages in the world.

Nevertheless, Einstein had already been proposed as a candidate to the Physics Nobel Prize in 1912, along with Lorentz, for his work on the Special Theory of Relativity. The recommendation came from Wien, a Prussian physicist, today he would be Polish, and who had worked in Berlin with Planck and was awarded the Physics Nobel Prize the following year, 1913, for his work on calorific radiation. Wien argued as follows: "While Lorentz should be considered the first who reached the mathematical content of Special Relativity, Einstein was able to reduce it to a simple principle. We should assign the merits to both researchers for their contributions that are comparable". The proposal was cast aside due to the lack of total acceptance.

Much has been argued about the true paternity of Special Theory of Relativity. Lorentz introduced in 1904 (Einstein presented his work in 1905) what is called FitzGerald-Lorentz contraction that defines the contraction of the length of an object at relativistic speeds and constitutes the basis of Special Relativity. On the other hand, Poincaré had already made known his ideas about the subject, also before 1905. These ideas referred to the speed of light as limit speed and mass increase with speed. Actually, Einstein always denied to have known these ideas of Poincaré.

Anyway, the Special Theory of Relativity has never been fully accepted and, even if it were, Einstein should have had to share the glory with Lorentz, as it was specified the only time a formal proposal was presented before the Nobel Foundation.

There have been great debates about the real paternity of the Theory and some people have even accused Einstein of plagiarism. The accusers couldn't understand how a 3rd class employ in a Patent Office could dedicate his time to a study so specialized as Physics without having gone into the thoughts of the great masters of this concrete theme. It must be said that Lorentz had attained the 1902 Physics Nobel Prize for his work on the influence of magnetism on radiation phenomena. It also must be said that the conclusions of Lorentz, which led to his transformation formulas, came after his great concern about the results of the Michelson and Morley experiments in the United States. The validity of Lorentz transformations constitutes a good explanation of the experiment. Well, Einstein also always denied that the American experiment should have influenced his reasoning. It seems as if his mind should have created a dense cloud between his reasoning and the contributions of others about the subject. Even so, I don't want to go into discussion about prospective plagiarism for lack of sufficiently reliable elements of judgement.

Although I should note here that all these disquisitions on the Lorentz transformations that opened the door to the Theory of Relativity had their origin in the experiments of Michelson and Morley. My Theory shows that a new and more logical interpretation of these experiments realized in the United States in 1887 leaves out of place to all Relativity and the increase of mass with the speed more than a relativistic problem is reduced to a simple geometric problem that a child can solve with certain knowledge of elementary geometry.

What is clear is that all Lorentz and Einstein's work on Relativity is based on the Michelson and Morley Experiment and the first conclusion of the experiment is the contraction of the length of an object at relativistic speeds. Other conclusions are the speed of light as limit speed and mass increase with speed. Poincaré ideas that Einstein denied knowing, working Einstein in a Patent House and being Poincaré one of the most prestigious physicists of the moment.

The photoelectric effect, for which Einstein received the 1921 Physics Nobel Prize, refers to the capacity of light to dislodge electrons from the atom. But this effect had been discovered in 1902 by Lenard, an experimenter. Einstein never was an experimenter. The Nobel Prize was awarded to him for the theoretical study of the phenomenon, proposing the Corpuscular Theory for light and reaching the conclusion that light consisted of little corpuscles, "light quanta", called "photons". This ended up in the great paradox of light: it is at the same time wave and particle. But this paradox was also extended to material particles, as the electron. The question arose: What was exactly an electron? According to writings of the time: "as a golf ball, an excited worm or a ball of wool". In that epoch, as well as today, the electron, the great protagonist of the technological progress in the XX Century, was the great unknown.

I introduce here some paragraphs of an Article by Richard Moody Jr. Published in Nexus Magazine - Volume 11 - Number 1 entitled "Albert Einstein - The Plagiarist of the Century", in December 2002 - January 2004:

"Einstein plagiarized the work of several notable scientists in his 1905 articles on Special Relativity and $E = mc^2$, but the Physics Community has never bothered to put things right in the past century.

Abstract

Einstein's defenders have acted in a way that seems to corrupt the historical record.

Albert Einstein (1879-1955), named by Time Magazine "Person of the Century", wrote a long treatise on the Theory of Special Relativity (which was actually called "On the electrodynamics of moving bodies", 1905a), without listing any references.

Many of the key ideas he presented were known by Lorentz (for example, Lorentz's transformation) and Poincaré, before Einstein wrote the famous 1905 paper.

As was typical of Einstein, he did not discover theories, merely confiscated them. He took an existing body of knowledge, collected and chose the ideas he liked and then intertwined them in a story about his contribution to Special Relativity. This was done with the full knowledge and consent of many of his colleagues, such as the publishers of Annals of Physics.

The most recognizable equation of all time is $E = mc^2$. The conversion of matter into energy and energy into matter is recognized by Sir Isaac Newton ("gross and light bodies are convertible with each other ...", 1704).

The equation can be attributed to S. Tolver Preston (1875), Jules Henri Poincaré (1900, according to Brown, 1967) and Olinto De Pretto (1904) before Einstein. Since Einstein never correctly derived $E = mc^2$ (Ives, 1952), nothing appears to connect the equation with something original from Einstein.

The selective presentation of data from the 1919 eclipse of Arthur Eddington in a way that supposedly supports Einstein's General Theory of Relativity is undoubtedly one of the greatest scientific frauds of the 20th century. His prodigal support for Einstein corrupted the course of the story. Eddington was less interested in proving a theory than he was in crowning Einstein as king of science.

The Physics Community, without knowing it perhaps, has incurred a type of fraud and silent conspiracy, which is the byproduct of being mere spectators when the hyperinflation of Einstein's reputation and record is carried out.

This silence benefited anyone who supported Einstein.

Einstein's pedestal is the product of the Physics Community, its followers and the media. Each group benefits greatly by raising Einstein to the status of an icon. The Physics Community receives billions in research grants, Einstein's supporters are very well rewarded, and media corporations such as Time Magazine get to sell millions of magazines by placing Einstein on the cover as "Person of the Century."

When the scandal breaks, the Community of Physicists, Einstein's defenders and the media will try to downplay the negative news and take a positive turn. However, his efforts will be put in evidence when Einstein's work, "On the electrodynamics of moving bodies", is seen as what it is: an accomplished act of plagiarism in the 20th century.

Special Relativity

Jules Henri Poincaré (1854 - 1912) was a great scientist who made an important contribution to the Theory of Special Relativity.

On the website of the Encyclopedia of Philosophy on the Internet says that the philosophy of Poincaré:

- 1. "outlined a preliminary version of the Special Theory of Relativity"*
- 2. "he declared that the speed of light is a speed limit" (in his 1904 paper of the Mathematical Sciences Bulletin 28, Poincaré indicated "a completely new mechanics, where inertia, increasing with the speed of light, would become a limit and would not be exceeded ")*
- 3. suggested that "mass depends on speed"*
- 4. "formulated the principle of Relativity, according to which no mechanical or electromagnetic experiment is able to distinguish a state of uniform motion and a state of rest"*
- 5. "derived from the Lorentz transformation"*

It is evident how deeply involved with the special relativity Poincaré was.

Even Keswani (1965) was driven to say that: "Already in 1895, Poincaré, the innovator, had conjectured that it is impossible to detect the absolute movement", and that "In 1900, he introduced "the principle of relative movement", which he himself later called by the equivalent terms the law of the Relativity "and" the principle of Relativity, in his book, Science and Hypothesis, published in 1902 ".

Einstein did not recognize any of this previous theoretical work, when he wrote his 1905 document without references.

Einstein, the Plagiarist

Now is the time to speak directly about the question of what Einstein was: he was first and foremost a plagiarist. He had few scruples about stealing the work of others and presenting it as his own. That this was deliberate seems obvious.

Why would Einstein, with his training as a patent employee, not recognize the need to cite references in his article on Special Relativity? One might think that Einstein, like a neophyte, would put an excess of reference instead of no reference.

*Anyone who doubts that he was a plagiarist should ask himself a simple question: "What did Einstein know and when did he know?" Einstein escaped with premeditated plagiarism, not with incidental plagiarism that is ubiquitous.
(Moody, 2001)*

The History of $E = mc^2$

Who originated the concept of matter that is transformed into energy and vice versa? Its origins date back at least to Sir Isaac Newton (1704).

Brown (1967) made the following statement: "Thus, the formula $E = mc^2$ gradually emerged, suggested without general evidence by Poincaré in 1900."

One thing we can say with certainty is that Einstein did not originate the equation $E = mc^2$. So the question is: "Who did it?"

Bjerknes (2002) suggests as a possible candidate for Tolver S. Preston, who: "He formulated atomic energy, the atomic bomb and superconductivity back in the 1870s, based on the formula $E = mc^2$ ".

In addition to Preston, an important player in the history of $E = mc^2$ that deserves a lot of credit is Olinto De Pretto (1904).

The Eclipse of 1919

There can be no clearer definition of scientific fraud of what happened in the tropics on May 29, 1919. What is particularly clear is that Eddington eluded the solar eclipse data to make the results fit the "work of Einstein on General Relativity. "

Poor (1930), Brown (1967), Clark (1984) and McCausland (2001) all address the issues around this eclipse.

*"Therefore, the numerous and elaborate eclipse expeditions have been given fictitious importance. Their results cannot neither prove nor refute the Theory of Relativity."
(Poor, 1930)*

On what Eddington based this was on a premature evaluation of the photographic plates. Initially, the stars do not "seem" to bend as they should, as required by Einstein, but then, according to Brown, the unexpected happened: several stars were then observed bending in a direction transverse to the expected direction and others more bending in a opposite direction to which predicts Relativity.

The absurdity of the information collected during the 1919 eclipse was demonstrated by Poor (1930), who pointed out that 85% of the data were discarded from the eclipse of South America due to an "accidental error", that is, it contradicted the Einstein constant scale. By a strange coincidence, 15% of the "good" information was consistent with Einstein's constant scale. Somehow, the stars that did not conform to Einstein's Theories managed to be temporarily and conveniently archived - and the myth began.

"Despite the fact that experimental evidence of Relativity seems to have been very weak in 1919, Einstein's enormous fame has remained intact and his Theory has since been considered one of the greatest achievements of human thought."

The BIPP asked: "Was this the deception of the century?" and exclaimed: "The report of the Relativity of the 1919 Eclipse of the Royal Society deceived us for 80 years!"

McCausland said that: "In the author's opinion, the confident announcement of the decisive confirmation of Einstein's General Theory in November 1919 was not a triumph of science, as is often portrayed, but is one of the most unfortunate incidents in the history of the science of the 20th century. "

It cannot be emphasized enough that the 1919 eclipse made Einstein, Einstein. It launched him internationally to fame overnight, despite the fact that the data was manufactured and that there was no support for General Relativity, absolutely.

This perversion of history has been known for more than 80 years and is still supported by people like Stephen Hawking and David Levy.

After these paragraphs taken from Moody's Article we will go into more details regarding formula $E = m c^2$. I introduce below an Article published in the press of the year 2007.

The formula $E = mc^2$ was not discovered by Einstein, but by an Italian

12.04.2007 - 18:55H

The mathematical equation that introduced the atomic era, $E = mc^2$, was discovered by an unknown Italian just two years before Albert Einstein used it to develop the Theory of Relativity, says Umberto Bartocci, a historian at the University of Perugia, and collects The Guardian newspaper.

De Pretto did not discover Relativity, but was the first to use the equation. According to Bartocci, it would have been Olinto de Pretto, an industrialist and mathematician from Venice, who first published the formula in a scientific journal called Atte, in 1903.

Einstein would have used the equation two years later in a popular newspaper to present a paper, but De Pretto never claimed, says Professor Bartocci, who says that Einstein's "abuse" was not detected until years later.

There seems to be obvious evidence that Einstein's performance leaves many doubts about his authorship regarding the Theory of Relativity and his contribution of one of the great formulas of Physics, such as $E = mc^2$.

There are 2 obvious facts:

- 1 - The Nobel Foundation never awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics to Einstein or anyone else for the Theory of Relativity.
- 2 - The discovery of the formula $E = mc^2$ is totally foreign to Einstein's participation.

On the other hand, Lorentz's transformations, which Einstein incorporated into his Theory, are based exclusively on the Michelson-Morley experiment.

I invite the reader to study in depth the aforementioned experiment as presented in the article previously published in this Magazine entitled: "New Interpretation of the Michelson-Morley Experiment".

The new interpretation is rigorous and comes to the strange conclusion that light behaves as expected and leaves out of place the great dilemma that it raised at that time and continues today taking Physics in places that it should never have been.

The negative result of the experiment was a great surprise and it led to a dilemma. Physics had to choose between two options:

- 1 - The Earth was the one body in the Universe which is permanently at rest.
- 2 - The principle of the addition of speeds, as in Classical Physics, was not valid.

The first option is hardly tenable and cannot be considered. Physics had only one path, which implied that the mechanical model of Classical Physics was in the end found to be definitely in contradiction with the result of this experiment.

In 1905, 18 years later, Albert Einstein presented his solution in the Special Theory of Relativity. Einstein drew a series of conclusions which have completely changed the meaning of Physics, forasmuch as it requires a contraction of time and space, introducing new ideas such as the contraction of a moving rod and the slowing down of a moving clock.

The principle of Relativity may be stated thus: There is no meaning in absolute motion. There is no standard at rest fixed by Nature. You may adopt any standard you wish. In other words, no one of any number of bodies moving with uniform relative velocities can be chosen more properly than other as a standard of rest. That makes the length of a body indefinite and that means that all other physical measurements that are definitely related to length must share that indefiniteness.

According to Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity, the velocity of light in empty space, determined by Maxwell's theory, is the same whatever the relative speed of the source and the receiver, regardless of the speed of either of these with respect to the Universe as a whole. In space, light moves at a speed of approximately 300.000 km/sec (299.794 km/sec). This speed is not dependent on the movement of the source of emission. On the other hand, the speed of light reaching an observer is not dependent on his movement. For a system in movement like the Earth, which moves at a speed v , c being the speed of light in space, the relative speed is not composed, as one might deduce from Classical Physics. On the contrary, the speed of light in respect of the Earth is constant, even if the luminous ray goes in the same direction as the Earth or the opposite or in any other direction.

All these new ideas that arose as a result of the famous experiment must be rejected and Physics will once again rely on solid foundations, also taking into account that all the other ghosts that choke it by strangulation can also disappear, such as The Higgs Boson, The Standard Model and Quantum Mechanics. These statements are the result of a rigorous study accompanied by **irrefutable** demonstrations and they are irreconcilable with the three mentioned ghosts.

Any Theory that does not hide in the Absurd and The Virtual World must face many experimental data. To cite some:

Nuclear forces must allow the union of protons in the nucleus.

Nuclear forces must disappear at the distance of a fermi.

The binding energy of proton and neutron in the deuteron must be 2.21 MeV.

The atomic nucleus is formed by the union of protons, but for this the presence of neutrons is necessary.

All simple material particles must have a spin or mechanical moment equal to $h/4\pi$.
 Bohr's atom theory is correct. Orbital electrons do not emit energy.
 Mass increases with speed according to the known formula called relativist.
 The speed of light as the maximum speed of matter.
 And much more data that are not mentioned here.

The curve that represents the value of the nuclear forces between proton and neutron, when the distance ranges between 0 and 1 fermi, which appears in several of my Articles published in the General Science Journal, it is impossible that it can be handled or simulated, it is the true curve from which it is deduced, calculating the area between the curve and the coordinate axes, the value of the binding energy of the two particles: 2.21 MeV. I dare to say that this simple test, without the need of the many others presented, is an unequivocal sign that the Theory is correct.

It is possible that someone may think that the mentioned curve that leads to the result of 2.21 MeV, coinciding with the experimental data, has been manipulated to arrive at the correct results. To those who think so I must say that such fraud would be very difficult, if not impossible. But above all, I have to tell them that "I am not so stupid."

Ah, a very important small detail that could annul a Theory that complied with all the mentioned experimental facts, in the event that this small detail was not fulfilled by the new Theory: the small detail is that the gyro-magnetic ratio of the electron must be e/m . It is quite possible that this data has gone unnoticed by Modern Physicists, since gyro-magnetic implies spinning, something that Modern Physics has long since rejected. Although one of the great Physicists of the 20th century, called E. Segré, Nobel Prize in Physics of the "old days" (1959), prior to the acceptance of the Absurd and the Virtual World, already spoke of dextrogyre and laevogyre particles, that is to say that they turned like a screw or in the opposite direction.

Those who know little about Physics will say: what does the gyro-magnetic ratio of the electron have to do here? The answer is that the "normal" gyro-magnetic ratio is $e/2m$ and not e/m (see Article "Starting Point of This Theory", page 4). A series of circumstances must occur in the electron that allow the gyro-magnetic ratio to reach e/m instead of $e/2m$. Here is the basis of this Theory and, I repeat, any other Theory that may appear, outside the Absurd and the Virtual World, must face this "little data", in addition to those mentioned above. I doubt that is possible.

How is this conceived in the face of the new situation that says that the electron is a virtual point? The ideas of "point" and "turn" are not reconcilable. Who has the reason? Segré, Nobel Prize before the "sinking" of Physics, mentioning the sense of "spin" or Modern Physicists considering the electron a point with a negative charge, an idea that, to be accepted, requires that new phenomenon in Physics called "virtual"?

As confirmation of the obvious fact that the material particles rotate I will quote the experiments carried out by Professor Krisch of the University of Michigan, at the Zero Gradient Synchrotron in Michigan, where he discovered that the outcome of a collision between two protons shows a surprising dependence on their directions of spin. Here are some comments from Professor Alan D. Krisch: Since 1972 he has concentrated on work with polarized proton beams, first in the Zero Gradient Synchrotron at the Argonne National Laboratory and since 1979 in the Alternating Gradient Synchrotron at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. This is what he says: "The outcome of a collision between two protons shows a surprising dependence on their directions of spin. The results challenge the prevailing Theory that describes the proton's structure and forces. **All the building blocks of matter, protons, neutrons and electrons, seem to be spinning like tops.** The spinning is a basic quantum-mechanical property; each particle has a definite amount of spin, or spin angular momentum, just as it has a definite mass and a definite electric charge. When two spinning particles collide, the direction of their spins can affect how they scatter, just as the "english" on billiard balls can alter their rebound after a collision. The results demonstrated that spin plays a significant role in high-energy interactions between protons. At sufficiently high energies it should make little difference whether two colliding protons are spinning in the same direction or in opposite directions. The fact that the spin directions do make a big difference suggests that our understanding of how protons interact with one another is incomplete. The experiments even call into question the currently accepted model of the proton's internal structure, which holds that a proton consists of three smaller constituents known as quarks, held together by the strong nuclear force (the force described by QCD). Our new results are certainly not the first time that the phenomenon of spin has surprised and confused physicists. The Quark Theory developed by Murray Gell-Mann of the California Institute of Technology has been truly successful in accounting for the masses of the many short-lived particles that are created when protons collide. On the other hand, the Quark Theory of particle scattering, Quantum Chromo dynamics (QCD), has made few predictions that could be verified. QCD is quite a flexible Theory and has been easily able to adjust to most new scattering data after the act; because I am a rather formal scientist, I am impressed less by adaptability than by predictive power. I also confess to some confusion about the notion that quarks can live as particles inside a proton but not outside. The clever and catchy QCD ideas that have been proposed to explain the apparent confinement of quarks may turn out to be correct, and perhaps I shall eventually change my old-fashioned view that particles must be well-defined objects. I believe, however, that a simple concept should not be abandoned in favour of a more complex one until the hard experimental evidence is overwhelming. Although we are not sure exactly what is causing this strange and totally unexpected behaviour, it does not appear to be good news for QCD."

"Perhaps we should also search for a new and more useful Theory of the interactions of spinning protons and of their spinning constituents. The longer I stare at our data, the more I feel it contains some simple message about the protons' constituents that we have not yet deciphered. I shall not guess at what might happen next, since surprises have

materialized whenever spin experiments have probed previously unexplored regions.... Since I am an experimentalist, I can only rely on the ultimate judge of scientific truth, experimental observation. Perhaps measurements made in the near future will yield a clue that will help some clever young theorist to finally understand the proton's constituents and their strong forces."

These experiments by Professor Krisch agree with this Theory: The interaction of spinning protons depends largely on the attraction or magnetic repulsion, which in turn depends exclusively on the direction of rotation.

These experimental data are enough for ANYONE to dare to propose a new Theory without, as I said before, going to the Absurd and the Virtual World. There cannot be two Theories that meet all these requirements and there is already ONE.

Concluding the analysis:

The Theory of Relativity was never accepted by the Nobel Foundation.

Lorentz transformations are not Einstein's discovery. (Apart from its validity being linked to the current interpretation of the Michelson - Morley experiment)

The equation $E = mc^2$ does not come from Einstein.

The speed of light as the speed limit of matter and the increase of mass with speed according to the equation

$$m_v = \frac{m}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}$$

are issues outside Relativity, their statement was made before Einstein and they are explained in the Article called "The Standard Model is wrong" applying simple geometric reasoning that a child can understand.

The question is: what is left for Einstein?

It is well known that since 1920, Einstein dedicated a great part of his efforts to the construction of a "Theory of the unified field", which could relate gravitation and electromagnetism. However, he died without reaching his object. In February 1950 the University of Princeton published his last Theory that consisted of 14 pages with 28 mathematical formulas which Einstein had worked out with great care and most physicists of the time said that poor Einstein was wasting his time trying to base all Physics on the field concept. This is what he said in his last letter: "Owing to some mathematical difficulties which are insurmountable at this moment, logical simplicity remains the only criterion to prove a theory is valid".

Ended December, 2019

Mailto: jdejuand@telefonica.net