Some comments about Mr Einstein first 1905 paper :

"*Concerning an Heuristic Point of View Toward the Emission and Transformation of Light*"

(A. Einstein, Ann. Phys. 17, 132 1905).

Jean de Climont (2012)

Abstract : There are two major inconsistencies linked to that first 1905 Mr Einstein paper. The first is related to the force binding electrons increasing with their respective distance. The second inconsistency is related to the discrete nature of phenomena.

Of course at that time the Rutherford (1911) and Bohr (1913) atomic theory was not yet established. Before, they thought that bodies were made of atoms (the present kernel) within a sea of electrons.

The problem is that Mr Einstein assumed that electrons are linked by **forces** proportional to their distance, although it was already established that electrons only repel.

"*Furthermore, let there be a number of electrons which are bound to widely separated points by **forces** proportional to their distances from these points. The **bound** electrons are also to participate in conservative interactions with the free molecules and electrons when the latter come very close. We call the **bound** electrons "oscillators": they emit and absorb electromagnetic waves of definite periods*."

The major inconsistency is to assume that a force could be proportional to the distance. Il will increase infinitely. This is a full non sense!

The second inconsistency is more general. The main point of the rationale of Mr Einstein is that:

"*According to the Maxwellian theory, energy is to be considered a continuous spatial function in the case of all purely electromagnetic phenomena including light, while the energy of a ponderable object should, according to the present*

conceptions of physicists, be represented as a sum carried over the atoms and electrons."

This is fully true. It is not consistent to assume that light as well as electromagnetic fields are both continuous and "discrete" (discontinuous). The inconsistency of Mr Einstein is that the third 1905 paper related to the special relativity theory and the 1915 paper related to the general relativity theory are both based upon continuous fields fully described by continuous equations.

To be consistent Mr Einstein should have stated that the field mathematical continuous equations for both electromagnetism and gravitation are not the reality but only a theoretical representation of the phenomenon. So that gravitation would not have been considered as a curvature of some distorted time-space frame, but as the action of some "quantum" exactly as he assumed electromagnetic fields to be within his first 1905 paper.

It is always possible to change one's mind. But it is not acceptable to be inconsistent. Because even though Mr Einstein would have been right to change his mind and to assume that finally all fields are continuous, it is fully wrong to consider that a phenomenon of Nature could be continuous. The error is exactly similar to the second major failure of STR assuming that the speed of light would be absolute. There are not any such things in Nature as continuous or absolute. This was the typical error of Aristotle. Absolute motion is a non sense. Absolute motion of the photon is a non sense.

So that the young Mr Einstein was right. This is a major inconsistency to believe something absolute and continuous may exist physically. Light is quantified, Electromagnetic actions are quantified, gravitation is quantified. Mathematical formulas as sophisticated they may be will never be anything else that a human representation of things occurring in Nature.

The question now is : does it exist a physical representation of what is occurring in Nature beyond the mathematical approach ?

The mainstream answer : no! They inherited the positivist approach of A. Comte and W. James. **Mathematical equations are the end of science**. The same positivists are the fathers of **Marxists searching for the end of history**.

No, it's not the end. We are there, all of us, gentlemen.