

THE THEORY OF RELATIVITY IS WRONG

Emil Gigov

24 August 2010

Very true scientists, such as Rutherford, Soddy, Michelson, Sagnac, Lenard, Larmor, McMillan and others, have claimed, that the Theory of relativity is wrong. Even Poincare and Einstein are hinted something similar. Classical physics is far from simple, already during the XIX century has been spoken about things like gravity waves, nuclear power and variable mass. Theory of relativity as a whole, is based only on the hypothesis, that the speed of light in Euclidean empty space is, invariant universal constant. But in reality this velocity is variable, in Newtonian sense. Newton's emission theory of light, has been proven through many experiments, for example by those of Michelson, Sagnac and Fizeau. Also, the velocity of photons in one ray, is variable with respect to lateral observer, and is consistent with the classical law for velocity addition.

The absolute fact, that the speed of light in vacuum is variable, is clearly proven by the interferometer of Sagnac. Also, this light gyroscope managed to ascertain the absolute rotation of the Earth, whereas the Michelson's interferometer did not find it. These results can be explained only by the classical emission theory of light. This theory is valid only in Euclidean empty space, and well explains all optical phenomena there. Consequently, the classical physics is valid there, not the relativistic. Also, in such a space there is no solid ether, but probably has some other. Accordingly, the wave theory of light is valid in non-empty space, where the field represents ether. There are also mixed corpuscular-wave situations, for instance the aberration of distant stars, where the rare cosmic atmosphere influences in two different ways. Moreover, the classical mechanical principle of relativity is also based on the emission theory. Therefore, the Lorentzian transformations are meaningless, and not everything is relative.

Theory of relativity is a subjective hypothesis, which contradicts many facts. For example, optically, the Earth appears in relative peace to us, but mechanically, it rotates absolutely, what is proven by a gyroscope. Consequently, the absolute mechanics is independent from the relative

optics, i.e. there are two types of phenomena, and are possible relative optical mirages without mechanical meaning. The same applies to the optical effects of Doppler and Bradley. Otherwise said, an apple does not become pear to observers. Furthermore, the Theory of relativity equalizes different things and exchanges them arbitrarily, which brings chaos in the physics. Thus, an apple could become pear, because they are both fruit, however this is absurd.

Some errors in the Theory of special relativity (TSR).

According to TSR, the space-time is relative, which means that there are no absolute phenomena, and there are countless different evolutionary lines for a given phenomenon, i.e. chaos. But in the Nature, there are absolute phenomena, such as electricity, magnetic field, annihilation, chemical reactions, etc.. Moreover, each system has only one evolutionary line, i.e. there is no chaos in Nature.

The special principle of relativity does not distinguish between rest and inertial motion, however in the Faraday's

law of electromagnetic induction, there is absolute difference between rest and movement of conductor in a magnetic field. In this law the motion is absolute, and even there is a difference whether is moving wire or field during acceleration. The faster is moving a straight wire through a magnetic field, the greater electrical voltage is generated. As the space has a magnetic fields, therefore we can distinguish between rest and movement towards them. Moreover, it is possible to make linear inductive motor, which can moves through space controllable.

The numerous paradoxes in TSR are untenable, because the true speed of light is variable. Especially absurd is the time paradox, which is as follows. In the inertial system moving relatively, time flows more slowly. This means, that if two clocks fly to one another, each of them lags behind the other, i.e. the two times will be double differential asynchronous. But in practice, such a dual delay is impossible and does not exist. For example, it is quite clear, that if the two clocks were synchronized before starting the translational relative motion, they will remain synchronous also after stopping this relative motion, irrespective of the observers. This is because, after all, there is no way in practice, each of the clocks to show less value than the other. In other words, the registered differential time lastly is zero, because it can not

have two different values simultaneously. On the whole, the time paradox clearly disprove TSR.

Relativistic Doppler effect is also paradoxical, because it is asymmetrical and uncompensated, since the blue is larger than the red. This is related to the appearance of the relativistic transverse red Doppler effect, better known as dilation of time caused by the relative speed. But this asymmetry contradicts to the law of conservation of energy, as well as to the effect of Fizeau.

In the relativistic law for velocity addition, it appears that an object has two different speeds simultaneously, towards one final observer, i.e. there is a paradox of speeds. The reason for this is, that there are two independent consecutive observers and a single object. Object itself can be a light beam. The first observer is an intermediary between the object and the second observer. The first one is independent of the TSR, because he can measure directly the relative velocity between the object and the second one, even if that speed is superluminal. The second observer is final, he calculate indirectly its relative speed to the object, using data obtained from the first observer, but apply to them Lorentzian transformations and obtains different value. Thus it turns out, that the second observer has two different speeds

simultaneously, toward the object. Moreover, the classical law for the velocity addition has been proven experimentally, which disproves the relativistic law. Consequently, the speed of light is variable, and is not equivalent to infinitely large velocity.

In TSR there is no Lorentzian transformation for the electrostatic charges of the particles. So the charges remain classical, absolute and constant, which is not typical for this theory. If the charges be transformed and become variable, then the masses of the particles would be completely different, in the mass spectrometer. Consequently, in TSR there's a conflict between the mass and the charge.

Hypothesis for relativistic mass leads to countless different evolutionary lines in a given system, but in reality there is only one evolutionary line. Furthermore, hypothetical relativistic mass increases exponentially due to the relative speed, however, that cannot be true in the general case. For example, according to the law of conservation of mass, the total mass in a closed system is a constant. Consequently, if an lateral observer, watching acceleration between two attracting opposite charges, their masses will not increase due to the speed toward him. Moreover, during the mutual acceleration of these opposite

Some errors in the Theory of general relativity (TGR).

According to TGR, everything is relative. But as is known, in Nature exist absolute things, such as the chemical properties of substances. Consequently, TGR is absolutely wrong.

In TGR there is gravity, but no electrostatic fields, magnetic fields and quantum effects. However, not everything in Nature is gravity. For example, the hypothetical dark matter becomes unnecessary, if we consider the presence of electrical fields in the galactic plasma.

The principle of equivalence is a limited special case, not common. This principle is not correct to heavy celestial bodies, as well as to rotating systems, because centrifugal force is not gravity. The actual rotation is absolute, this is evidenced by a gyroscope, irrespective where it is placed in a given rotating system. Thus we conclude, that there is a centrifugal force rather than gravity. Furthermore, in Nature there is no such type of centrifugal gravity, it contradicts the law of Newton. Also, TGR have no logical explanation, why actually working the gyroscopes.

The mentioned principle of equivalence, is also wrong in the rectilinearly accelerating closed system. For example, nowhere in the Nature does not exist such homogeneous gravitational field, having equal intensity everywhere. The approximation, that the imaginary homogeneous field is normal gravity field is inadmissible. If we assume such an approximation, then with the same success we can assume, that a given slight rotation is rectilinear uniform motion, thus the principle of relativity is disproved by a gyroscope. Furthermore, during acceleration the floor pressures the body, whereas in gravitation is the opposite. Also, the acceleration can be created and changed arbitrary, while gravity – can not, i.e. acceleration is not gravity. As regards the next hypothesis, that internal horizontal light beam is bend to the floor, this never been proved to internal observer. And if this hypothesis is correct during acceleration, this does not mean, that it is true in the gravitational field, to an internal observer. Towards him, this hypothesis contradicts the postulate of constancy of the speed of light, and corresponds with the emission theory of light. Thereby, the beam accelerates and dephases to the floor, without changing its frequency, so the optical time is synchronous everywhere in the system and only is dephased, it is not asynchronous. And there are two types of time, optical and mechanical. The first is relative and is a mirage, whereas

the second is absolute and real. Mechanical time is synchronous and sync-phase everywhere in the accelerating system. This time is measured by a common mechanical clock, for example through a long vertical rotating shaft.

The principle of equivalence also is not true towards the Universe, in which is located given accelerating platform. For example, accelerating observer, sees increasing stellar aberration, while an observer standing in the gravitational field, sees unchangeable stellar aberration, i.e. gravity is not acceleration, again. Besides, there is no kinematic reason for the existence of gravitational lenses in the outer inertial world, especially in independent lateral inertial system consisting of a light source and observer. This is explained in the following manner. In the principle of equivalence, mechanical acceleration and gravity are the same thing, thus, free fall and inertial rest are also the same thing. Furthermore, it is known, that if an inertial observer is at rest relative to the celestial sphere, he sees zero stellar aberration. This aberration is always zero for this observer, irrespective of whether somewhere one arbitrary platform is accelerating or not. In other words, any arbitrary foreign acceleration, does not create additional stellar aberration for this observer. Consequently, any arbitrary foreign gravitational field, also does not create additional stellar aberration for

this observer. This means, that there are no gravitational lenses toward distant inertial observer. Also, toward him, there are no decelerations of time and light, in the foreign gravitational fields. This also means, that if distant inertial observer sees the real gravitational lenses, then gravity is absolute and TGR is wrong. According to the relativists, gravitational lenses exists for any observer, but actually this disproves TGR.

As is known, around every star there is atmospheric optical lens. This lens does not depend on the field, because above the atmosphere continues to be a field, but no lens. In other words, there is no gravitational lens, but only atmospheric refraction. This is proven in practice by observations of stellar aberration around the Sun, as well as by observations of stars orbiting around the center of the Galaxy. Therefore, the light is not attracted by gravity, i.e. photons are not typical particles. Otherwise there would be no light, and no evolution of stars. Even is likely, light to be weakly repulsed by the gravity. Also, the hypothesis of so-called cosmic black holes do not correspond to the truth, because observations indicates, that these objects shines continuously, in different spectra, and have real mass. And also, it is impossible to exist gravity without mass, nor yet infinite contraction at finite mass, nor yet teleportation. As regards the so-called gravitational red shift of stars, as far as such, it can be

explained in several different ways. For example, by: Compton effect in the atmosphere of the star; Doppler effect from gravitational contraction of the star; decrease of the velocity of the absolute time in the absolute gravity. The true gravitational field is absolute, material and anisotropic, hence the speed of the local mechanical time is absolute and is different at diverse heights in the field.

Because the light do not attracts by gravitational field, light accelerometer is possible, which may register only mechanical acceleration. Such a device can be made by light interferometer, for instance like that of Michelson or Fizeau, but with two different cameras, one empty and other of monolithic glass.

The general principle of relativity also is untenable, for example because there are absolute motions. Every rotation is absolute, this is evidenced by gyroscope.

Cosmological hypothesis of expansion of the Universe, derives from the world of Minkowski rather than from the Hubble effect. He himself believes, that redshift of distant galaxies is a new optical phenomenon, not a Doppler effect. In the expansion hypothesis, the Universe is finite, has a center and is anisotropic. And since we are not in

the center, the Hubble effect must be anisotropic, but actually it is isotropic. Thus, the hypothetical center appears all around us in deep space, i.e. this center is around the Universe, not inside it, which is impossible. Also, there is no way how the Universe has been an infinitely small hypothetical point, which expands into itself. Furthermore, the calculated relativistic speed of expansion to deep space, significantly exceeds the speed of light, which again contradicts to the postulate of constancy of light-speed. Moreover, quasars do not follow Hubble's law. As regards the hypothetical age of the Universe, amounting about 14 billion years, it does not correspond to reality, because there are many older galactic clusters in the Cosmos.

The Hubble effect have also other reasonable explanations, except as cosmological dopplerian redshift. For example by: so-called tired light; Compton effect; increase of the speed of time during evolution; Doppler effect due to condensational contraction of newly objects. Most likely several of these explanations are correct simultaneously, i.e. only part of the Hubble effect can be Dopplerian. Else, the relic radiation actually expresses only the present temperature of the Universe, i.e. represents a space thermal noise. This radiation is just like a thermometer, it does not prove neither expansion nor contraction of space. In addition, the relic radiation is not

dragged with the dilute plasma in the Solar system, unlike the light, because these radio-waves are too longwaved and do not resonate with the free particles.

Many basic nuclear phenomena has been discovered before the advent of relativism and do not depend on it. Nuclear reactions are developed mainly through experiments, for instance so is found the controllable disintegration of uranium under the influence of slow neutrons, by Hahn. While fusion of lightweight atoms in the Sun, and in particular the synthesis of helium from hydrogen, is predicted in the mid XIX century by Prout and others. However, the relativistic hypothesis on the mechanism of nuclear fusion is wrong. According to this hypothesis, which is proposed by Eddington and further developed by Bethe, the main reason for nuclear fusion in stars is the temperature, whereas the pressure is an additional factor. In this, the emitted light has a gravitational mass and stars become lighter. It follows, that if a heavenly body is supermassive and cold, it will never begin nuclear fusion, i.e. cold fusion is impossible. But in reality, the temperature of stars is a consequence of the fusion, not a reason for it. The true cause for nuclear fusion there, is the pressure created by the absolute critical mass. Every star begins to shine, when reach such a mass. Respectively, cold nuclear fusion is possible, and even already has been made laboratorial by Fleischmann

and Pons. On the other hand, hypothetical controllable thermonuclear fusion, has not yet been implemented, probably because high temperatures can disintegrate elements more, than merging them.

It is known, that the normal precession of the elliptical orbit of Mercury, is calculated with Newtonian mechanics, whereas the additional small anomalous precession of this orbit, is calculated separately through a special formula. But this additional precession is a hypothesis, dependent on conditions throughout the Solar system, and may be wrong, i.e. may not exist such a precession. Nevertheless, in TGR there is formula for calculating the additional precession of the Mercury's orbit, which formula is the same as that of Gerber derived earlier. But this formula is wrong in itself, regardless of how it has created, because it contains not one, but two unknown quantities, which are dependent on one another, they are: the Mercury's precession and the Sun's mass. This is, because the formula is made for an isolated system of two bodies, heavy and light, where the heavy central mass is represented by quantities, which are dependent from the precession of the lightweight orbiting body. In this situation, there is no way to write or to calculate, how much is the mass of the Sun, because we do not know how much is the precession of Mercury. And since the central mass is unknown, then there is no way to calculate the precession

of the planet. It turns out, that to calculate one value, we must know how big is the other, but in this formula, they both are unknown, so it is impossible to identify them. If we measure the mass of the Sun otherwise, then we must measure the precession of the Mercury otherwise too. Consequently, Gerber's formula is unnecessary and wrong. Furthermore, the observations of the precession of double stars, disproves this formula, because the results do not match with it. In general, the formula is based on only one particular case and is arbitrary. Moreover, this formula is of classical type and is not compatible with TGR, because the given system is mechanical, heliocentric and absolute, not relative. Therefore, in TGR there is no correct formula for calculating the additional precession.

The additional precession of a given celestial body, leads to emission of gravitational waves, moving with the speed of light. A similar idea was proposed by Gauss and others in the XIX century. According to him, the gravitational charge is variable, it depends on the orbital speed and diffuses with the speed of light. As a consequence, when a body orbiting along a curve line, it broadcast gravitational waves, traveling with the speed of light. In other words, there is some special friction in the gravitational field, something like gravitational ether wind. Gauss also made an hypothetical formula, adjusted especially for the additional precession of the Mercury,

which formula is not valid for other bodies. Then, Gerber develops further this formula, but it became even more hypothetical and untenable. As regards the registration of the weak gravitational waves, it is almost impossible, because they merges into a common background. On the other hand, tidal prove the existence of such longitudinal field waves.

Conclusion.

From the given examples is visible, that the Theory of relativity is wrong, and is necessary a new natural theory. For instance, a theory in which the gravitational field is something like universal fluidal anisotropic absolute reference system.