

ESSAY 63: Consequences of the Collapse of Einsteinian General Relativity.

The collapse of Einsteinian general relativity (EGR) means huge problems for the subject of physics or natural philosophy, more accurately it presents huge problems for dogmatists. It presents no problems for nature itself or for school pupils with no vested interest in the theory. School pupils can easily understand now why the theory is wrong by use of UFT202 and differentiating of the equation of the precessing ellipse. If that is a little too difficult for them they can use computer algebra on their ipods or laptops. By reference to volume one of my autobiography the general readership can gauge the standard of education in a grammar school of the sixties, and can see that school pupils could and can differentiate a precessing ellipse. That is all that is needed to prove that EGR is nonsense.

In a healthy subject that conclusion would be accepted as the simple truth, and natural philosophy seeks the simple truth. The orbit of a planet is a precessing ellipse, and that orbit is not described by Albert Einstein's theory of general relativity. Dogmatists who have wasted millions of public money and who have saturated the media with complete nonsense for years are faced with irrefutable evidence that any school pupil can tell them about. If they admit that they were wrong how can they hang on to their jobs and funding? That is not a question that nature cares about, only human nature would bother with all that. So do they shoot the messenger or not? There are an awful lot of messengers who can do differentiation.

I suppose that the most ridiculous ideas of all are black holes and big bang, ideas pushed on to the TV screens from the sixties onwards. The mathematics of those ideas are riddled with errors, errors known about for nearly a century. So we can't shoot dead messengers without exorcism on an industrial scale. At this point any school child would ask why we need to hang on to ideas that are wrong. It is one of those questions that the innocent ask, and there is no answer possible from a decadent dogmatist. A scientist would answer that there is no need to hang on to anything and that nature always shows. Nature has just shown that Albert Einstein's theory and ideas were wrong. Albert Einstein would have shrugged his shoulders and corrected his ideas. The corrections are not very difficult. Only the so called experts would try to show that ordinary simple differentiation does not work. They need their funding after all.

They could resort to the cover up and boycott of all scientists, but that is not possible in the age of the internet, where dogma is instantly rejected as soon as it appears. The methods of promoting dogma are also instantly rejected. However prestigious a journal is claimed to be, it will still be rejected instantly if it denies simple differentiation. They could resort to musical chairs, which was the term used in the seventies and eighties for rigging a funding committee. That would plough yet more millions into their coffers, but for what purpose? With fuel rationing around the corner will they be able to travel to all those expensive conferences that look like gatherings of the faithful?

At this point the innocent would ask why don't they use their education and talent to produce new forms of fuel and energy. Again the dogmatist would reach for the heavy artillery, but there are so many messengers out there now. We come to the most awkward question of all, how can a theory that is wrong be proven to be right by experiment? A school child would start giggling about the laundering of data. Those data must be very clean of grease by now. In fact the internet abounds with criticisms of those experiments that set out to prove all through the barbaric twentieth century that an incorrect theory is very precise. All those claims can be instantly rejected by differentiating a precessing ellipse. Even if NASA makes those claims, they will be rejected by algebra: by algebra itself, and not the person or ipod doing the algebra, and one cannot shoot algebra. The school child would

realize instantly that strenuous efforts must have been made to cook the data. The school child is as perceptive as the adult. In other words the straight line was drawn and the experimental results arranged around it later on. The only alternative is to abandon differentiation and fail an O level.

So what a ghastly mess has been made of physics. I think that those school children will grow up into better scientists and set about looking for new energy, they will have to in order to survive.