

Einstein's Theory Revised by Person(s) Unknown

Roger J. Anderton

UK

e-mail: R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com

Einstein's Special Relativity presents major problems to us because he failed to clearly state his theory, changed his mind numerous times, got his math in a mess, and so forth. Not only that, his theory was revised by person or persons unknown. As will now be explained, that means "we" cannot even know what his theory "is" - i.e. not know what he intended his theory to be - and also not know what these unknown person(s) that revised the theory intended that theory to be. If the amended 1905 paper of Einstein's Special relativity were a legal document, it would be dismissed as bogus, because it would be impossible to know what the amendments mean. The foundation of modern physics is thus a far bigger hoax than the Piltdown man.

It is possible to piece together what really happened, in a nutshell: Einstein copied his theory from Poincare; not being all that clever (contrary to the popular myth of his genius), he was unable to properly understand Poincare's theory, and made a mess of things. Various people have come close to working out the details. For instance, Alberto A. Martinez tells us:

"It is also well known that Einstein studied and was influenced by Poincare's works. At a younger age, Einstein had been immersed in the philosophy of Kant. But, by 1905, owing to his readings of Mach, Poincare', and especially Hume, Einstein abandoned the idea that notions of space and time are a priori knowledge." [1]

To obscure the issue, Einstein's 1905 paper on Special Relativity (SR) referenced no sources, leading some of his dedicated fans to believe that he thought it all through independently. These fans allow their hero worship to distort facts, because Einstein gave information about his sources in his correspondence [2-3].

Why Einstein was allowed to publish a scientific paper without citing sources is very peculiar; presumably some special privileges were given, or the procedures for scientific publication in 1905 were contrary to what we now expect. Whatever the reason, the inability to properly check Einstein's sources has blocked many investigations from establishing how Einstein formed his theory, and if he formed his theory correctly.

Now added to the confusion over Einstein's sources, and the mistakes he made from them, is the subjection of his work to revision by person or persons unknown. As an example, the commonly cited 1923 English translation language of Einstein's famous 1905 paper on SR has mysterious footnotes [4]. Indeed, all the footnotes present problems, but it suffices for now to emphasize the problem with footnote (2), which says: "i.e. to the first approximation." Martinez says there is no evidence that Einstein added this amendment, and adds: "Such footnotes originated in an edition of 1913 by Otto Blumenthal, which includes notes by Sommerfeld." [1] Maybe Sommerfeld added it or someone else; we don't know. But they influence current thinking about relativity theory.

Next, let's look at the claim in Einstein's original 1905 paper:

A. "Let us take a system of co-ordinates in which the equations of Newtonian mechanics hold good." [4]

With footnote (2) this effectively becomes

B. "Let us take a system of co-ordinates in which the equations of Newtonian mechanics hold good to first approximation."

The difference may not look like much, but do not be deceived; they represent two different theories.

A. - is completely within the context of Newtonian physics.

B. - treats Newtonian physics only as an approximation.

Let's call them theory "A" and theory "B". Theory "A" is part of Newtonian physics, and theory "B" is not. So we immediately have an ambiguity of which theory is correct. Worse, we don't even know whose theory is whose. As to the unknown reviser, Martinez tells us:

"Presumably, this specific footnote was added to harmonize the pertinent sentence with special relativity, which revises many equations of Newton's mechanics." [1].

I.e. the reviser recognized that there was a problem in Einstein's paper; it did not make sense, so he added the footnote. But that then changed claim "A" to claim "B", and so changed theory "A" to theory "B".

To recap: Einstein made a mess, certain unknown person(s) recognized it was a mess, and then revised what Einstein said. But they did not state who "they" were, if Einstein agreed with their revision, etc. So "they" added more to the mess. SR thus became just a bodged collection of different ideas.

This has led to many conflicting claims regarding what SR theory really "is". Hence, SR as a settled, clear and undisputed theory is a bigger hoax than the Piltdown man. The Piltdown man was cobbled together from different fossils pretending to be part of the same fossil. In Einstein's SR, different ideas were cobbled together pretending to be part of the same theory.

Before Einstein, the operating paradigm was definitely Newtonian physics; after Einstein, all was a mess. If SR were simply theory "A", then Einstein just made lots of mistakes, but it's still just Newtonian physics. Then Einstein's SR would merely be the mess he made of Poincare's theory. However, if SR is really theory "B", we have an issue too long to deal with here [5].

Today we have scientific leadership like Royal Society president Martin Rees, who says that scientists need "the freedom to be wrong" [6]. In effect, Rees admits that science is in a mess, and believes it should be in a mess. This "mess" should not be the scientific legacy that we are passing on to future generations.

References

- [1] Alberto Martinez, "Conventions and Inertial Reference Frames", *American Journal of Physics* **73** (5): 452-454, (2005) https://web.space.utexas.edu/aam829/1/m/Relativity_files/Conventions-1.pdf.
- [2] Albert Einstein, **Letters to Solovine**, p. 9 (Philosophical Library, 1986). Martinez [1] gives some examples as: Einstein intensely analyzed La Science et l'Hypothese, recalled M. Solovine.
- [3] Albert Einstein, **The Meaning of Relativity**, p. 3 (Princeton University Press, 1946). In a lecture delivered in 1921, Einstein argued, "It is essential here also to pay strict attention to the relation of experience to our concepts. It seems to me that Poincare clearly recognized the truth in the account he gave in his book La Science et l'Hypothese."
- [4] Albert Einstein, "On the Electrodynamics of Moving Bodies", *Annalen der Physik* **322** (10): 891-921 (30 June 1905), <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/>.
- [5] Roger J Anderton, "Einstein's Theory as His Misunderstanding of Poincare's Theory", *General Science Journal*, 3pp. (2011), <http://wbabin.net/weuro/anderton99.pdf>.
- [6] Roger J Anderton, "On Give Scientists the Freedom to be Wrong", *General Science Journal*, 4pp. (2011) <http://wbabin.net/weuro/anderton95.pdf>.