

# Relativity's Nontheoretical Inutility

An Argument for the Factual Pragmatism of Classical Physics

Ken Gonder\*

Unaffiliated Independent

(Prepared for viXra.org open-access repository 9/26/2024)

## Abstract

Relativity has little practical relevance in our real nontheoretical three-dimensional classical Newtonian environment. Its founding premise, light's (presumed) constancy, is conceptually impossible. It only works theoretically in the one dimension of linear motion and only in one direction. In the three actual dimensions of our tangible physical existence, its required contraction in the forward direction that would maintain its constancy in motion would always be in conflict with its noncontracted velocity to the sides and its necessary expanded velocity to the rear. In reality, light's velocity can only compound mechanically with the motion of its source and that of other bodies/reference frames (which is what all of the Michelson-Morley type experiments actually show). And that's in addition to its factual variability that Einstein also asserts despite the invalidating contradiction. Space doesn't actually exist either. It's the nothingness between objects. And neither does time. It's not an inherent property of the universe. So there can be no such thing as "space-time." But it's preemptively invalidated anyway by its inconceivable four-dimensionality that he also has impossibly curving two-dimensionally as it dents underneath three-dimensional massive bodies to contradictorily cause them to mechanically react instantly at the speed of light while somehow creating an attractive force that pulls them together facilitated by unobservable massless graviton particles. His "principle of equivalence" is just as unworkable. Acceleration/braking's one-dimensional opposite uniform reaction and rotation's two-dimensional outward dispersive centrifugal reaction cannot in any way be interpreted as gravity. Nor are they even remotely equivalent to natural mass-created gravity's three-dimensional inward coalescing/condensing.

\* kgonder0@gmail.com

Einstein's "finite and yet unbounded" universe, that with expansion has become the big bang, is strictly theoretical as well. To maintain its observed uniformity, he has it expressing two-dimensionally like the surface of a sphere. Existence being physically impossible in two dimensions, it also can't be real. With relativity's manifest impracticality and the purely theoretical nature of its fundamental constituents, nearly all of it can be factually qualified as useless. This realization not only renews our appreciation for the commonsense validity of classical physics but also our faith in the innate rationality of the universe in general.

## **Contents**

<b>Abstract</b> _____	<b>1</b>
<b>Light's Constancy</b> _____	<b>3</b>
<b>Time</b> _____	<b>5</b>
<b>Motion's Subjectivity</b> _____	<b>6</b>
<b>Light's Variability</b> _____	<b>6</b>
<b>Mass-Energy</b> _____	<b>7</b>
<b>Principles of Relativity</b> _____	<b>7</b>
<b>Gravity</b> _____	<b>9</b>
<b>Equivalence Principle</b> _____	<b>11</b>
<b>Gravitational Redshift</b> _____	<b>13</b>
<b>Big Bang</b> _____	<b>18</b>
<b>Conclusion</b> _____	<b>21</b>
<b>Implication</b> _____	<b>21</b>
<b>Coda</b> _____	<b>23</b>
<b>Declarations</b> _____	<b>24</b>
<b>References</b> _____	<b>24</b>
<b>Ancillary References</b> _____	<b>26</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> _____	<b>27</b>

## **Light's Constancy**

Light's presumed constancy, that Einstein adopted as relativity's founding premise, is conceptually impossible in our real nontheoretical world of three actual dimensions [1]. (Use **[Alt][←]** to return.) The relativistic effects of special relativity (light's slowing in the direction of motion, time's dilation, and length's contraction for moving objects/reference frames, the conditions presumed necessary to maintain light's constancy [2]) would cause light's velocity perpendicular (or at any angle) to the direction of motion, including to the rear, to diverge from that of the forward direction, and it'd exceed 186,000mi/s.

A simple example would be the light emanating from your car's headlights. When you're traveling down the highway at 60mph, it'd supposedly be leaving your car (your reference frame) at 186,000mi/s minus 60mph. Your car, and its occupants, would supposedly be contracting correspondingly in the direction of their motion. And your car's rate of time would supposedly be slowing correspondingly all to maintain light's presumed constancy.

If you were to then pull out a flashlight and point it out the window perpendicular (or at any angle) to your direction of travel, what would be the speed of its light? It can't be the same as in the forward direction. There's no motion or contraction in that direction.

But time's contracted "slower" rate would still have to be affecting its velocity. Different rates of time in different directions is not possible. The "slower" contracted rate of time in the forward direction would have to also affect light's noncontracted velocity to the side, which would cause it to exceed 186,000mi/s by 60mph.

Time's rate has to apply equally over any entire reference frame. It can't be one rate when looking in the forward direction and another when looking in any other direction. Einstein agrees with this, despite the invalidating contradiction [3].

So light's velocity can never remain constant. Conceptually, it's not possible. In reality, it always has to radiate equally in all directions at the same time regardless of a reference frame's motion(s). This plainly indicates a compounding of light's velocity with the velocity of its source and that of other reference frames.

This is indicated by all of the Michelson-Morley type experiments and confirmed conclusively by Sagnac's experiment [4]. They show that light's velocity remains the same in every direction simultaneously regardless of the Earth's rotational and orbital motion, our solar system's motion through our galaxy, and our galaxy's motion through the universe. But light's compounding remains unrecognized and/or ignored, and/or suppressed.

Einstein does acknowledge though, contradictorily and in an intentionally ambiguous way, that the theory of relativity only works in the one dimension of linear motion and only, "in one direction [5]." If it doesn't work in the three real dimensions of our actual environment then it's altogether untenable. It becomes nothing more than a theoretical exercise.

The same applies to the Lorentz transformation (a system of equations that Einstein adopted for relativity that translates the space and time coordinates from one reference frame to another [6]). It too only works in one direction in linear motion, and only for one occurrence at a time between only two reference frames. We recognize and accept its one-dimensionality. But for some unknown reason, we refuse to see that its one-dimensional limitation makes it utterly useless in our real world, demonstrating again that it's impossible for light's velocity to be fixed. It can only compound with motion.

All of those airborne clock experiments that are incorrectly inferred as validating relativistic effects are actually only recording the result of a small charge that's been imparted to their atomic clocks' cesium atoms from their motion through the Earth's magnetic field. This slightly increases their mass, causing their natural frequency to slow that in turn causes their clocks to run slightly slower. It's not time's slowing due to (subjectively decided [7]) relative motion [8].

Time's increasing rate with altitude is not the product of gravitational time dilation (time's presumed slowing from relativistic effects as gravity increases [9]). It's actually due to the condensing of the clocks' cesium atoms with elevation in the decreasing density of the Earth's magnetic field that increases their natural frequency. This in turn causes the clocks to run slightly faster, not time's rate to increase.

For clocks that are even higher or farther away from the Earth, as they leave the decreasing density of its magnetic field they transition to the ever-increasing density of the Earth's and our solar system's gravity field. This causes their cesium atoms to expand slightly, which slows their natural frequency that in turn causes the clocks' rate of operation to slow.

Their rate of operation is also slightly slowed by their motion through these combined gravity fields. This imparts a charge to their atoms, which increases their mass that further decreases their natural frequency that in turn causes the clocks to run a bit more slowly.

It's this in combination with light's (radio signal) increasing velocity in the ever-increasing density of those gravity fields that makes it appear as if the pioneer spacecraft were slowing more than expected [10].

Motion can never cause time's rate of passage to slow. It can only reduce an atomic clock's rate of operation by inducing its cesium atoms with charge as they traverse an electromagnetic and/or gravity field that in turn increases their mass that slows their natural frequency [A][B].

## **Time**

"Time" itself does not exist. It's not an inherent property of the universe. It's a concept we've created by selecting objects with periodic motion, like the Earth's rotation and orbit or the natural frequency of cesium atoms of atomic clocks, that establishes a convention that we then use as a reference. In reality, there's only a continuous present moment that's ever-changing. So time's rate cannot change with motion due to light's fixed velocity [11].

But even if time actually did exist, its theoretical changing rate for objects/reference frames in motion forced by light's constancy would be increasing. It would not be slowing/dilating. To coordinate with an object's contraction in the direction of motion, also forced by light's constancy, time's rate would have to contract correspondingly. A contracted rate of time is not a slower running or dilated rate of time. It's a faster rate of time [A][C].

## **Motion's Subjectivity**

Einstein delusively argues that an object's rate of motion or whether it has any motion at all is a subjective choice of each individual observer that's made independently. But each observer's choice would impossibly conflict with the choices of every other observer [7].

And what about objects with multiple motions? Every object is moving in more than one direction at the same time. Take the Earth for instance or any object on its surface. It's rotating about its axis. It's in orbit around the Sun. It's moving with our solar system's motion through our galaxy. And our galaxy is moving through the universe. These are not subjective choices. How are the relativistic effects of these compounded motions determined and simultaneously expressed [C]?

## **Light's Variability**

A couple of years after initially proposing (special) relativity, Einstein correctly realized that light's velocity actually varies in gravity fields [12]. But that completely invalidates his assumption of its constancy. Just like the untenability of its constancy, light's variability undermines relativity in its totality.

After recognizing this nullifying conflict, he rationalized light's constancy. He asserts that its velocity does still remain fixed, but only when outside of gravitational fields when they can be disregarded [13].

But where are the places where gravity fields don't exist? They're everywhere. They extend indefinitely. And every object, be it particle or galaxy or our entire (presumed) finite universe, has its own self-gravity [14]. So there are no places where light's velocity can be fixed.

If no place exists where light's velocity can be fixed or disregarded then relativity can have no validity. Einstein recognized that, "...as a consequence of this [light's ubiquitous variability that'd have to include its compounding], the special theory of relativity and with it the whole theory of relativity would be laid in the dust [15][A][C][D].

## Mass-Energy

It's myth that Einstein conceived "his" famous mass-energy relation,  $E=mc^2$ . Several others expressed it decades before. Depending on the definition and notation used for energy and mass and whether it was written in word or equation form, it was actually Hendrik Lorentz<sup>1</sup>, or Gilbert Lewis<sup>2</sup>, or Richard Tolman<sup>3</sup>, or possibly even others who originally conceived the exact equation.

Apparently, the only time he published the formula was for a Time magazine article in 1946 that he used as a simplified analogy for the general reader. He maintains that the proper expression is,  $E_{\text{kinetic}} = mc^2 / \sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ , where the energy,  $E$ , is limited to the kinetic energy of motion, not any type of energy, and it incorporates the Lorentz transformation because of his (contradictory) belief in light's constancy [16].

If it's not possible for light's velocity to remain constant then the Lorentz transformation has no validity and Einstein's version doesn't work. But it also doesn't work when limited only to the kinetic energy of motion. The general form,  $E=mc^2$ , only appears to work in accelerators (and under other similar circumstances) when particles are imparted with a charge from the electromagnetic field pushing them (or a charge from the field they're traversing) that increases their mass proportionally per the general formula. Their mass can never magically increase due to light's (incorrectly assumed) constancy because of (subjectively decided) motion [A][C].

## Principles of Relativity

Einstein imagines three illusive and evolving principles of relativity. He maintains that all are correct and functionally in force despite that each supersedes and replaces, and conflicts, with the previous. Principles by definition are supposed to be fixed and unchanging.

1. Dutch physicist, 1853-1928.

2. American physical chemist, 1875-1946.

3. American mathematical physicist & physical chemist, 1881-1948.

His first is commonly known as special relativity. He refers to it as "the special principle of relativity," or "this principle of relativity," or "the principle of relativity," or "the special theory of relativity," or "the principle of the physical relativity of all *uniform* motion," or "the *principle of relativity* (in the restricted sense)." He uses all of these expressions interchangeably. He defines this principle as, "every motion must be considered only as relative motion... [where the] general laws of nature (e.g. the laws of mechanics or the law of the propagation of light *in vacuo*) have exactly the same form in both cases [when drawing comparisons] [17]."

His second principle of relativity is commonly referred to as general relativity. He refers to it as "general relativity," "relativity," "the theory of relativity," "the principle of relativity," "the general principle of relativity," "the general theory of relativity," "the generalized postulate of relativity," "the extended theory," "the provisional formulation." He uses all of them interchangeably as well. He defines it as, "All bodies of reference... are equivalent for the description of natural phenomena (formation of the general laws of nature), whatever may be their state of motion [18]."

His last relativity principle is rarely referred to, "Exact Formulation of the General Principle of Relativity." He defines it as, "*All Gaussian co-ordinate systems are essentially equivalent for the formulation of the general laws of nature.*" The, "exact formulation... replace[s] the provisional formulation of the general principle of relativity [19]."

This nonsense is impossible to follow or logically defend or rationally explain. Ultimately, it's not decipherable. And it's hard to believe that the ambiguity is not intentional. It may have been subconscious. But either way, it's impossible to deny that the equivocality is obscuring the underlying folly.

Those advocating for the legitimacy of these counterfeit principles are just rotely reacting from their groupthink conditioning. They haven't rigorously investigated them personally. At best, they're overlaying them with their own preconceived interpretations to rationalize and explain away all the incongruities [C].



## Gravity

Einstein proposes a nonsensical solution to gravity that is naively accepted as real but is utterly unworkable. The problems begin with his incorrect assumption about space. It's not something. It doesn't exist. By definition, space is the nothingness between objects [20].

So there's nothing there to curve (or to expand, or stretch, or cause light's redshift from stretching). He then melds that nonexistent space with a nonexistent time into an inconceivable four-dimensional "space-time continuum [21]."

Then he has that purely theoretical four-dimensional abstraction curve two-dimensionally as a nonexistent plane. A plane by definition doesn't exist either. Its two-dimensionality can only define a location that's planar [22].

Also, curvature is a property limited to one or two dimensions. In three dimensions, any change in a substance can only express as a variation in density. Conceptually, it cannot curve [23].

He then has that curving, two-dimensional, nonexistent plane of inconceivable, four-dimensional, nonexistent spacetime somehow dent underneath three-dimensional massive bodies as if they were all affected by the "pull" of the gravity of a much more massive body positioned underneath them.

The denting then somehow induces their attraction by somehow causing them to roll downhill toward one another despite not actually rolling or being uphill. If this were actually possible, it'd be a mechanical reaction, which are essentially instantaneous.

All of this conflicted nonsense is at odds with more of his unworkable self-conflicting dogma that has gravity propagated by a force similar to electromagnetism that somehow pulls bodies together, acting at the speed of light via waves [24]. But the belief has also been adopted that gravitational attraction is also somehow concurrently mitigated by mysterious unobservable massless graviton particles that somehow exist physically without mass [25]. Which if they actually were particles, wouldn't be able to act at the speed of light either. They'd relativistically become infinite [26].

It's difficult to believe that all of this overtly unfeasible, metaphysical gimmickry is uncritically embraced and then enthusiastically perpetuated as viable, consensus established orthodoxy, especially when gravity's actual solution and its unification with electromagnetism is so conspicuous.

Subatomic particles don't pop into existence out of nowhere. They naturally condense out of the all-pervasive field of radiant electromagnetic energy that comprises the universe. This produces a commensurate decrease in the universal field's density.

But that decrease in density isn't distributed evenly throughout the entire universe. Most of it takes place immediately around emerging particles because of a field's intrinsic uninterrupted continuity. This has it diffusing inward exponentially because of a sphere's innate geometry that's bound to the inverse square law. (The inverse square law is a function of the three-dimensional geometry of an expanding sphere. Its density, which is the same as the intensity of an electromagnetic or gravitational field, is inversely proportional to the square of the distance from its center: Density, or Intensity,  $1/r^2$  [27].)

It's the field's inward exponential diffusion that establishes a particle's, and the bodies they compose, gravity field. Whether that diffusion is dissipating inward or outward doesn't matter. It's still bound to the exponential gradient set by spherical geometry.

Naturally compelled to seek equilibrium in the varying density of their ever-merging gravity fields, all bodies from particles to galaxies are constantly pushed mechanically by the highest field density toward the lowest that's always located directly in between them toward their common center of mass. This causes their unrelenting gravitational coalescing toward one another. Runaway coalescing naturally ensues.

When enough material accumulates, the resultant pressure from the ever-decreasing density of their ever-combining gravity fields begins to trigger fusion reactions. This ultimately transmutes every particle back into the pure uncondensed electromagnetic radiation from which it arose.

Despite the obviousness of gravity's actual solution and the utter simplicity of its unification, and that academia considers it its holy grail, it remains unrecognized. Their intractable groupthink commitment to relativity's delusive ideology is the only reason they can't see it. Abandoned relativity and all of cosmology's seemingly irresolvable problems simply disappear [D].

## **Equivalence Principle**

Einstein concocts a "principle of equivalence" from his inference that inertial mass (mass in motion) is no different from gravitational mass (mass affected by gravity). He first envisions that mass expresses as both inertial and gravitational when in reality there is no such thing as either inertial or gravitational mass. There's only mass [28]. It has inertia (a property of matter by which it remains at rest or in uniform motion [29]) when moving and weight when it's at rest in a gravity field.

Then he argues that his invented inertial and gravitational masses are not actually different types of mass. But they're really the same thing. From this, he then "reasons" that acceleration/braking and rotation (inertial mass) actually create real gravity with fields that are the same as each other and the same as natural, mass-created gravity (gravitational mass) [30]. But just a cursory comparison quickly reveals they're not even close to being similar, let alone equivalent.

Acceleration/braking's reaction is uniform throughout all locations of a body (or a reference frame). It acts only in one dimension, opposite the direction of motion. It doesn't coalesce and condense objects like real gravity. And it doesn't require mass. It only requires increasing velocity. Its reaction is mechanical. So it effectively acts instantaneously.

Rotation's centrifugal force acts outward. And it acts in only two dimensions, perpendicular to the rotation's axis. It becomes stronger with distance. It also doesn't require mass. It only requires rotation, and its force becomes stronger as the rotation increases. It also doesn't coalesce and condense objects. It disperses them outward. Its reaction is also mechanically instantaneous.

The centrifugal force of a rotating body would vary from zero at its poles where there's no rotation to its maximum at its equator where its rotation would be the fastest. So its centrifugal-created gravity, unlike natural gravity, would vary at its surface over the entire body.

Natural, mass-created gravity acts inward, three-dimensionally, radially, toward the center of every mass, or common center of multiple masses. It becomes exponentially weaker with distance. It continuously coalesces and condenses objects together in a ceaseless runaway process that creates ever-increasing pressure that eventually triggers fusion reactions that ultimately transmute all matter back into its primordial state of radiant electromagnetic energy.

Natural gravity only requires mass. It doesn't require rotation or any other motion. The distortion that acceleration-created and rotation-created gravity would impart to a body/reference frame would be completely different from each other and from that of mass-created gravity.

For any accelerating and/or rotating object, how could their acceleration-created and rotation-created gravity ever coexist or exist with their real mass-created gravity? All their reactions would be in conflict with one another.

If acceleration-created and rotation-created gravity are the same as each other and the same as mass-created gravity, how can light's constancy, time dilation, length contraction, and increasing mass ever manifest for accelerating objects? These relativistic effects, according to Einstein, can't occur in gravity fields because of light's variability in them. Accelerated particles quickly come to mind.

How can acceleration-created and rotation-created gravity be real when Einstein contends that the rate of an object's motion/rotation or whether it even has any motion/rotation is a subjective choice of each observer? They'd be absurdly altering the amount of gravity it has in addition to deciding its rate of motion/rotation.

Equivalency's explicit fallacy is not insignificant. Einstein contends that if his gravitational redshift is found to be invalid then relativity will be untenable [31]. His gravitational redshift is based on equivalency. If equivalency isn't valid then his gravitational redshift isn't valid. So relativity can't be tenable [C].

## **Gravitational Redshift**

Einstein is generally credited with being the first to describe gravitational redshift (the displacement of the spectral lines of atoms or an object in a gravity field toward the longer, redder wavelengths of the electromagnetic spectrum [32]). But Einstein's version is actually very different from what's generally accepted.

The most common explanation for gravitational redshift begins with the assumption that a photon's escape from a massive body is impeded by gravity. If it's affected by gravity then it must have gravitational mass. A photon doesn't innately have mass. But it's thought that its velocity gives it inertia. So it must have inertial mass. Then because of Einstein's (erroneous) principle of equivalence, its inertial mass is the same as gravitational mass. That's how photons are reasoned to be affected by gravity.

It's believed that since they have to travel at the speed of light, because light's velocity is presumed to be fixed, their impeded escape does not decrease their velocity. Instead, it's imagined that they lose energy that expresses as a decrease in light's frequency that creates longer, redder wavelengths. Those explanations that (correctly) accept light's variability in gravity fields simply reason that as it emerges from a gravity well, it is its slower velocity that reduces or redshifts its frequency.

Even though Einstein contends that light's velocity varies in gravity fields, his version of gravitational redshift is still based on time's relativistic dilation due to light constancy. He actually expects us to believe that because all motion, including rotating motion, causes time's dilation due to light's fixed velocity, and because of his assumption that the spectral lines of atoms can be regarded as a clock, another delusion, time's slowing shifts those spectral lines toward the red end of the spectrum.

And because a body's rotation causes both time's slowing and centrifugal-created gravity, a relationship must exist between redshift due to time's slowing and centrifugal-created gravity. The faster the body's rotation, the more redshifted its light and the stronger its centrifugal-created gravity.

Then because of equivalence (rotation's centrifugal-created gravity is the same as nonrotating, natural, mass-created gravity) rotation's centrifugal-created gravity's dilated rate of time, expressed as redshift, can and has to be applied to nonrotating, natural, mass-created gravity. So higher redshifts have to indicate stronger nonrotating, natural, mass-created gravity. If this sounds crazy, it's because it is. It's not because it's been misinterpreted [33].

It's difficult sometimes to rationally explain irrationality. Nonsensical ideas are inherently hard to follow because they don't make sense. And in Einstein's case, no one wants to believe they're incoherent and fallacious. But the fabricated complexity and disqualifying absurdity of this particular logic chain that's based on delusive assumptions and correlations exemplify the convoluted, illusive reasoning and the manic fanciful nature that permeate all of relativity.

But let's proceed anyway and try to put his version of gravitational redshift in proper context. First, as we previously covered, time doesn't really exist. It's not an actual property of the universe. That's enough right there to disqualify the whole concept. But also, it's conceptually impossible for light's velocity to remain constant. It compounds with motion. It's also variable, which Einstein agrees with but ignores.

Einstein has already conceded light's variability in all gravity fields and rationalizes that its constancy can only occur outside of gravity fields. If its velocity cannot be fixed in gravity fields then any attempt to establish a relationship between redshift and the strength of a gravity field, that's based on time's relativistic slowing due to light's constancy *in a gravitational field*, is contradictory and nonsensical.

So his gravitational redshift's relativistic foundation subverts it from the outset. If light's velocity is not fixed, rotating motion cannot cause nonexistent time to slow. And if there's no such thing as time then an atom's spectral lines cannot be regarded as a clock.

Considering spectral lines as a clock has no basis. He just declares that it's so, deceptively asserting it as fact. If time did actually exist and it could change with motion, there's no reason why its changing rate would have an effect on spectral lines, shifting them in one direction or the other.

Also, remember time's relativistic slowing is incorrect. To correctly correspond with an object's length contraction, its rate would actually have to be increasing with motion, not slowing/dilating. So if relativistic effects were actually possible, which they aren't, rotation-created gravity's time would then be increasing. So time's rate in a gravitational field would not be dilating. It'd be speeding up.

The rotation of a celestial body varies from zero at its poles to its maximum at its equator. This means that its rotation-created gravity will vary accordingly over the entire body. With an infinite number of rotation-created gravities to choose from along with its associated redshifted light, how can it ever be rationally correlated with a singular, mass-created gravity that's the same for the entire body to establish a valid gravitational redshift?

But if a relationship does exist between the displacement in the spectral lines of an atom and its natural frequency, which is perfectly reasonable to infer, we could rationally theorize several ways that a celestial body might produce a red or blue shift in its light. The natural frequency of an atom would increase when subjected to stronger gravity, a field of decreased density. Its contraction would innately produce faster oscillation, which would tend to blue shift its light.

But it's possible that its spectra might still be redshifted if it were originating from a stronger gravity field. Light's velocity propagates slower in fields of decreased density. Also, any celestial body that was rotating faster due to its contraction would be induced with an increasing charge. This would slightly increase the mass of its atoms, causing an increase in its gravity and a slowing in its natural frequency. Both would produce a redshift.

These processes would give rise to higher redshifts for more condensed bodies. This would cause them to appear to be receding with a Doppler shift. But the actual distance between them measured from their centers would remain the same [34].

This offers a much more practical explanation of the redshifted displacement of an atom's spectral lines than Einstein's contradictory assertion of nonexistent time's impossible relativistic slowing from a body's rotation that he irrationally contends creates a gravity field from its centrifugal force that he delusively correlates through contrived equivalence to natural, mass-created gravity.

A rotating mass does not create centrifugal gravity. As covered earlier, it does not and cannot exist. So if it's nonexistent then no equivalence can be drawn between it and natural, mass-created gravity.

If equivalency can't be drawn between centrifugal mass (inertial mass) and gravitational mass then his "principle of equivalence" is a fallacy as well. But even if centrifugal gravity did exist and could be associated with dilated time, indicated by redshift, there's still no basis to infer that centrifugal gravity's redshift correlates to the strength of natural, mass-created gravity.

He never attempts to explain how that might work. He can't. The correlation cannot be rationally drawn. He again just declares that it's so. That doesn't make it reality.

As if dealing three-card monte, what he does (again, maybe subconsciously, it's hard to say) is skillfully obfuscate redshift's cause and effect. He transfers it from rotation's relativistic time dilation to natural, mass-created gravity's strength, using its inferred association with centrifugal-created gravity as the translating intermediary. If it's not intentional misdirection, it's profound delusion.

Einstein never suggests that acceleration-created gravity would redshift an atom's spectral lines. If equivalence compels all gravity to be the same, it'd have to. The greater the acceleration, the stronger the gravity, the more relativistically redshifted they'd be. If this were actually true, it'd have significant consequences.

And what about gravitational time dilation? How could it ever be accurately determined for bodies that also had any of the other types of gravity fields like equivalency's acceleration-created or rotation-created gravity? Or what if they had relativistic time dilation from linear acceleration or relativistically increasing mass from linear acceleration that increased their natural, mass-created gravity? We could never know how much time dilation to attribute to each type of gravity.



But if time actually did relativistically slow for moving objects and if an atom's spectral lines could actually be regarded as a clock then the light of any moving object, whose rate of motion remember is supposedly subjectively decided by each observer, would have to be redshifted as well. Take a moment to consider the implications.

But even beyond that, let's say that if acceleration-created gravity, rotation-created gravity, the relativistic effects of special relativity, and his or conventional gravitational redshift all existed and worked as theorized then we'd never be able to know the true gravitational redshift of any accelerating or rotating body. In addition to their natural, mass-created gravity, they'd have increasing gravity from relativistically acquired mass from linear acceleration, or increasing gravity from equivalency's acceleration-created or rotation-created gravity.

But we'd have no way of ever determining the source or sources of the gravity or how much gravity was originating from each. So the body's gravitational redshift would become meaningless.

The relativistic basis and delusive, metaphysical gyrations of his inferences mount to nothing more than a theoretical game of make-believe. None of it has any chance of ever actually manifesting in our real physical world.

Even so, Einstein still declares that, "If [it's discovered that] the displacement of spectral lines toward the red by the gravitational potential [gravitational redshift] does not exist, then the general theory of relativity will be untenable [31]." Actually, all of it would be. If his gravitational redshift, which is based on relativistic effects, does not exist that'd have to mean that relativistic effects don't work. If that's true then special relativity would also have to be untenable.

If gravitational redshift, on the other hand, was found to exist so general relativity (and special relativity) could be tenable, where would that leave the big bang? Gravitational redshift would coexist with cosmological redshift [35]. How then could the universe's rate of expansion, or whether it's even expanding at all, ever be determined? It couldn't. They're indistinguishable from one another. We'd never know how much redshift to attribute to each. So the big bang would be untenable. Ultimately, relativity and the big bang cannot coexist [C][E].

## Big Bang

Most people don't realize to what extent Einstein is responsible for our embarrassingly surreal big bang cosmology. If it wasn't for his non-Euclidean "finite and yet unbounded," metaphysical delusions, we'd quickly realize that the universe's clear uniformity would never allow it to be finite or expanding. It'd have to be infinite (as we all instinctively know it really is).

He contends that with the advent of his curving non-Euclidean geometry and Bernhard Riemann's<sup>4</sup> "discovery" of two-dimensional three-dimensional space, we can now correctly perceive the universe as finite. To preserve its homogeneous isotropic nature, which is what we observe, he has it manifest as the continuously curving, two-dimensional surface of a sphere. He infers his solution to be unbounded as well, despite that existence would be confined, or bound, to a sphere's two-dimensional surface [36].

Its tendency to condense in on itself from gravity would theoretically remain consistent so it could be uniformly resisted by a constant counteracting agent. This wouldn't work for the internal volume of a three-dimensional finite universe. It'd be continuously collapsing in on itself from its self-gravity with its condensing increasing exponentially.

He first counteracts his two-dimensional universe's uniform condensing mathematically with a "cosmological term," a constant that would represent a universally uniform repulsive force of some kind. But later, he abandons his constant for space's uniform expansion as proposed by Alexander Friedmann.<sup>5</sup> He thought it to be a more natural solution [37].

The obvious problem, though, is the big bang's two-dimensionality. There's no existence in two dimensions. Without the third dimension of height, all we're left with is the location of the curving plane of a sphere's surface.

4. German mathematician, 1826-1866.

5. Russian mathematician, 1888-1925.

A three-dimensional finite expanding big bang cannot work under any circumstances. It can never remain uniform. First, a spherical volume can never express uniformly. It's physically impossible as indicated by the platonic shapes: tetrahedron, octahedron, and icosahedron. The legs of uniformly distributed equilateral triangles around a sphere's surface are always longer than the sphere's radius. When a sphere's interior volume is quantified into distinct units, its radius will always be less than the legs' length when their triangles are evenly spaced around its perimeter [38].

The big bang's finiteness would also give it self-gravity that would have it condensing and collapsing in on itself exponentially because of a sphere's innate geometry that has to conform to the inverse square law. This could never be countered with a constant force, or uniform expansion. They'd always be mismatched.

For universal expansion to counter gravity's inward collapse, it'd have to be decreasing from the universe's center out. And it'd have to do it exponentially to exactly match gravity's exponential coalescing. Try to imagine how that would work. You can't.

The big bang's expansion would also cause the universe to be diffusing from its center out exponentially because of a sphere's inherent geometry that's bound to the inverse square law. Its inferred increasing rate of expansion would be another insurmountable complication.

For the big bang to remain uniform, it'd have to be constantly creating new material at its expanding perimeter. The quantity of which would have to be increasing exponentially to match its physical diffusion. Even then, the new material would be coalescing into newer, younger galaxies that would clearly distinguish themselves from the older ones that would remain behind near the universe's center.

A three-dimensional big bang would also exhibit an origin that would be easily discernible, that is if we didn't end up by chance at its exact center. Whether it was condensing/diffusing from gravity/expansion, or even if it was theoretically uniform, we'd still see fewer galaxies in the direction of our outward-bound expansion where the universe's expanding perimeter would be closest. We'd see more galaxies in the opposite direction toward and beyond the universe's origin. And we'd still see the same thing even if the universe wasn't expanding.

Cosmological redshift would also easily reveal the location of the universe's origin. It'd be less for those galaxies closest to ours that were expanding outward in the same direction as us. And it'd be greater for those galaxies that were expanding in the opposite direction on the other side of the universe's origin.

So if the universe can't be finite and it can't be expanding, what is the source cause of cosmological redshift? It can't be the Doppler effect of the recessional velocity of each galaxy or (nonexistent) space's stretching or light's stretching as (nonexistent) space expands. The most obvious and rational explanation is gravity's inherent runaway nature.

At the scale of galaxies, it produces an ever-increasing infall of ever-coalescing material that's ceaselessly migrating inward toward a galaxy's common center of mass. Combined with our own infall velocity toward our own galaxy's center, this creates a recessional velocity (or sometimes a closing velocity) from the material of every other galaxy that's redshifted (or sometimes blueshifted) from a Doppler effect.

As the infalling material nears a galaxy's core, the ever-increasing pressure from its exponential condensing triggers fusion reactions that collapse it back into the radiant/plasma energy it first originated from and radiates it back out. Or in well-developed spirals, it's spewed out in huge bipolar jets.

Eventually, it slows, cools, and at some point reconstitutes back into ordinary matter. It can then begin gravitating back to its or another nearby galaxy in a never-ending process of perpetual recycling [C][E][F].

## **Conclusion**

This constitutes the essence of relativity's elusive/illusory ideology. There is more. For those interested, it can be found easily enough through the references and bibliography. But this synopsis alone should be more than sufficient to establish its factual untenability, which in turn confirms the objective practicality of classical Newtonian mechanics.

It should be perfectly clear that relativity is a complete fictionalization. That it's totally fabricated. It's not rationally comprehensible because it's factually incoherent. It's unfounded, illogical, conceptually absurd, inherently self-contradictory, and it's fundamentally impractical, entirely unfeasible and physically impossible. What else can be concluded? It postulates an inconceivable, make-believe universe that cannot in any way exist in reality. It's so nonsensical, it's laughable.

Many may disagree with this analysis, even vehemently. That's fine. Just show me how it's incorrect. I'll be more than happy to recant. All I'm looking for is reality. But for those who do follow the logic and ascribe to this thesis, they have to be left wondering why relativity continues to be so embraced and so fervently defended by so many when it's so demonstrably unworkable and its many invalidating contradictions are so overtly conspicuous.

It's an open question that begs an answer. One that I believe has more to do with subjective psychology than objective physics that has to be explored by each of us individually and in the end can only remain personal opinion.

## **Implication**

As I see it, there are only two explanations for relativity's undue persistence. And it's possible that both could be applicable at the same time. But they're dependent on whether you believe Einstein was cognizant or not of its untenability.

If you believe he wasn't, then you might conclude that we've embarrassingly misconstrued his nonsensical technobabble as profound esoteric genius. The comedy *Being There* comes to mind [39].

If you believe he was, then you might infer that Einstein was more spurious, intentionally employing gimmickry and misdirection to beguile an already mesmerized audience. The well-known parable *The Emperor's New Clothes* seems germane [40]. (Everyone knows that only the wise and intelligent are capable of comprehending relativity.) Either way a large degree of gullibility on the part of relativity followers is indicated that now has them trapped.

Their pride won't allow them to admit their error, what they really see, or acknowledge reality. Conceding their embarrassing faux pas or that they've been duped is out of the question. The humiliation would be unbearable.

So they quickly sacrifice their integrity, and reality, content to remain bound to their compulsory big bang-relativity groupthink (that they call consensus), endlessly rationalizing an explicitly fictitious ideology through subconscious confirmation bias. And just like in the parable, the harder they pretend, the more foolish they appear.

There may be other explanations that better account for relativity's unfounded continuance. But whatever they might be, it's still highly improbable that a workaround will ever be found that can rationalize light's errant invariance. And without light's invariance, relativity just doesn't work, none of it.

So regardless of the explanation or the unpleasantness of the consequences, they ultimately have no choice. Sooner or later they're going to have to come clean and admit their stupendous error and unprecedented gullibility.

They need to maturely set aside their pride, endure the inevitable embarrassment, and squarely face this huge impending crisis. It will, no doubt, be an unmitigated disaster. Other sciences not even ancillary to cosmology will also be unable to avoid the backlash. They'll be discredited as well. The funding repercussions will be ruinous across-the-board.

No matter how much they might wish otherwise, their predicament is not going to go away. Covering it up won't work either. It never does. Trying to ignore it also won't work. One way or another, the truth always finds a way to emerge. And the aftermath is only going to get worse the longer it's denied/delayed.

But given the human psyche's innate narcissistic/sociopathic tendencies, its obsession with status, dominance, and control, and its unrestrained passion for self-affirming groupthink (that insures the status quo through consensus confirmation bias that upholds the preordained dogma and narratives necessary for entrenched pseudo-intellectual elites to maintain their prestige and authority), it may take generations before they're able to face the harsh but inescapable reality of relativity's irrefutable inutility.

## **Coda**

It's not just possible, but it's highly likely that relativity is cosmology's only remaining obstacle. Realistically then, the most, or really the only, practical way forward is to fully embrace its factual untenability and renounce it completely.

But we shouldn't be panicked at this prospect. Scrambling to find a new or trying to rethink our entire existing cosmology is unnecessary. Classical physics works perfectly fine after all the baseless relativistic assumptions are weeded out. It just needs to be recognized [G].

As unbelievable as it may seem, the universe's true nature is laid bare by simply discarding relativity in its totality. All of its perplexing mysteries are dissolved. And everything at every scale falls squarely into place, including gravity and its unification, in surprisingly simple and unexpected ways.

What we'll actually discover is that neither complicated math nor proprietary knowledge is necessary. That genius is not a prerequisite. That all it takes is a smidgen of common sense, a clear receptive mind, and a genuine desire for reality.

## Declarations

The author certifies that he did not receive any funding, grants, or any type of support from any individual, institution, or organization in the connection with the study or preparation of this work. The author further certifies that he does not have any financial or competing interests in connection with this work or ties of any kind to any individual or organization that might.

## References

- [1] Albert Einstein, *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*, 15th ed. Translated by Robert W. Lawson (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1961), 21-23.
- [2] Einstein, *Relativity*, 32-46.
- [3] Einstein, *Relativity*, 31.
- [4] "Michelson-Morley Experiment," Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia, last modified Dec 26, 2022, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michelson-Morley\\_experiment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michelson-Morley_experiment); "Sagnac Effect," Wikipedia, last modified Dec 24, 2022, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sagnac\\_effect](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sagnac_effect).
- [5] Einstein, *Relativity*, 44.
- [6] Einstein, *Relativity*, 34-39; "Lorentz transformation," Wikipedia, last modified Dec 2, 2023, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lorentz\\_transformation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lorentz_transformation).
- [7] Einstein, *Relativity*, 16-18, 30, 67, 68...
- [8] "Hafele–Keating experiment," Wikipedia, last modified Aug 24, 2022, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hafele-Keating\\_experiment](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hafele-Keating_experiment); A. G. Kelly, "Hafele & Keating Test; Did They Prove Anything?" Cartesio Episteme, [www.cartesio-episteme.net/H%26KPaper.htm](http://www.cartesio-episteme.net/H%26KPaper.htm).
- [9] "Gravitational Time Dilation," Hyperphysics, last access Dec 28, 2022, <http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/Relativ/gratim.html>.
- [10] "Pioneer anomaly," Wikipedia, last modified Jul 10, 2024, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pioneer\\_anomaly#](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pioneer_anomaly#):
- [11] "Time," Merriam-Webster Dictionary, last modified Mar 28, 2023, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/time>.
- [12] Einstein, *Relativity*, 85, 104, 109, 171.
- [13] Einstein, *Relativity*, 85, 109.
- [14] "Gravity," Wikipedia, last modified Jan 1, 2023, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gravity>.
- [15] Einstein, *Relativity*, 85.
- [16] "Mass-energy equivalence," Wikipedia, last modified Feb 20, 2023, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass-energy\\_equivalence](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass-energy_equivalence).
- [17] Einstein, *Relativity*, 16, 67-68.



- [18] Einstein, *Relativity*, 69, 108.
- [19] Einstein, *Relativity*, 108.
- [20] "Space," Merriam-Webster, last modified Mar 26, 2023, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/space>.
- [21] Einstein, *Relativity*, 61-64.
- [22] "Plane (mathematics)," Wikipedia, last modified May 25, 2023, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plane\\_\(mathematics\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plane_(mathematics)).
- [23] "Curvature," Encyclopedia Britannica, last update Feb 17, 2023, <https://www.britannica.com/science/curvature>.
- [24] Einstein, *Relativity*, 72.
- [25] "Graviton," Wikipedia, last modified Nov 29, 2022, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Graviton>.
- [26] Einstein, *Relativity*, 50.
- [27] "Inverse Square Law," Hyperphysics, last access Dec 28, 2022, <http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/Forces/isq.html>.
- [28] "Mass," Merriam-Webster, last access Aug 30, 2023, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mass>.
- [29] "Inertia," Collins Dictionary, last access 2023, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/inertia>.
- [30] Einstein, *Relativity*, 75-79, 172.
- [31] Einstein, *Relativity*, 151.
- [32] "Gravitational Redshift," Wikipedia, last modified Dec 19, 2022, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gravitational\\_redshift](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gravitational_redshift).
- [33] Einstein, *Relativity*, 88-91, 147-150.
- [34] The Doppler effect is the change in light's frequency resulting from the relative motion between two objects; "Doppler effect," Wikipedia, last modified Aug 32, 2023, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doppler\\_effect](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doppler_effect).
- [35] "What is cosmological redshift," How Stuff Works, last access Dec 27, 2022, <https://science.howstuffworks.com/cosmological-redshift.htm>.
- [36] Einstein, *Relativity*, 122-127.
- [37] Einstein, *Relativity*, 153.
- [38] "Platonic solid," Wikipedia, last modified Apr 24, 2023, [https://en.wikipedia/wiki/Platonic\\_solid](https://en.wikipedia/wiki/Platonic_solid).

- [39] A 1979 movie that's based on the 1970 novel by Jerzy Kosinski of the same title (American author, 1933-1991). To paraphrase, Peter Sellers plays a simpleton gardener named Chance (Chauncey) who inherits his wealthy benefactor's aristocratic clothing. Inferring him to be one of their own as his newly acquired sophisticated attire suggests, establishment elitists embarrassingly misconstrue his nonsensical gibberish as profound esoteric wisdom. It is funny; *Being There* (novel), Wikipedia, last modified Apr 16, 2024, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Being\\_There\\_\(novel\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Being_There_(novel)).
- [40] You're probably already familiar with Hans Christian Andersen's popular 1837 fable (Danish author, 1805-1875). To paraphrase, charlatans sell a vain Emperor an expensive but nonexistent suit under the guise that only the wise and intelligent are able to see it. Wanting to avoid appearing ignorant and a simpleton, everyone went along until a young child blurted out what he really saw. But the Emperor and his aristocratic court's arrogance and conceit wouldn't allow them to admit their error and that they'd been duped. Instead, they continued to foolishly pretend but now with even greater effort; "The Emperor's New Clothes," Wikipedia, last modified Sept 21, 2024, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Emperor%27s\\_New\\_Clothes](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Emperor%27s_New_Clothes).

## Ancillary References

- [A] Ken Gonder, "Light's Presumed Constancy," viXra open-access archive, Jun 22, 2023, <http://vixra.org/abs/2208.0159>.
- [B] Gonder, "Resolving Relativity's Unresolvable Paradoxes," viXra open-access archive, Feb 9, 2024, <http://vixra.org/abs/2402.0042>.
- [C] Gonder, "Equivalency's Fallacy," viXra open-access archive, Sept 5, 2023, <https://vixra.org/abs/2305.0102>.
- [D] Gonder, "Gravity's Origin, Impetus & Unification," viXra open-access archive, Sept 5, 2023, <https://vixra.org/abs/2305.0094>.
- [E] Gonder, "Cosmology in Crisis?" viXra open-access archive, July 10, 2023, <https://vixra.org/abs/2206.0160>.
- [F] Gonder, "Uniformity in a Finite Universe," viXra open-access archive, July 10, 2023, <https://vixra.org/abs/2207.0120>.
- [G] Gonder, "Relativity's Tenuous Tenability," viXra open-access archive, July 26, 2024, <https://vixra.org/abs/2407.0154>.

## **Bibliography**

- Arp, Halton. *Seeing Red: Redshifts, Cosmology & Academic Science*. Montreal: Aperiron, 1998.
- Einstein, Albert. *The Meaning of Relativity*. 5th ed. Translated by Edwin Plimpton Adams, Ernst G. Straus, Sonja Bargmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Einstein, Albert. *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*. 15th ed. Translated by Robert W. Lawson. NY: Three Rivers Press, 1961.
- Encyclopedia Britannica, last access 2024, <https://www.britannica.com>.
- Gonder, Ken. *The Reality of Relativity*. 7.4 240606, Last revision 2024. Amazon, Independently published, 2018, <https://www.amazon.com/dp/B07CVMDV66>, (LCCN: 2020901711).
- Hyperphysics, last access 2024, <http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu>.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary, last access 2024, <https://www.merriam-webster.com>.
- NASA, last access 2024, <https://www.nasa.gov>.
- Science News*, 1999 - 2018, <https://www.sciencenews.org>.
- Scientific American*, 1994 - 2024, <https://www.scientificamerican.com>.
- Sky & Telescope*, 2000 - 2024, <https://skyandtelescope.org>.
- Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia, last access 2024, <https://www.wikipedia.org>.