

Mr. Bridgman,

Your comments on the GPS are irrelevant. If a theory is intrinsically inconsistent and violates the usual conservation of energy and momentum so well established by very many experiments it is invalid despite any alleged putative verifications of that theory. The Ptolemaic theory is an example of a theory that rendered putative verifications but is incorrect. General Relativity is in the same boat. Also, as I pointed out long ago on this forum your assertion that I have a theory is patently false, as I have never advanced any theory at all, merely a demonstration that General Relativity is invalid due to contradictions in physical principles, erroneous mathematics and violation of the usual conservation of energy and momentum. You never retracted your false assertion. Similarly your remarks on 'test' masses in analogy with electrodynamics is invalid because in electrodynamics the Principle of Superposition applies but not in General Relativity and mass and charge are not coupled to space by any set of equations in electrodynamics as they are in General Relativity, especially when bearing in mind that according to Einstein his Principle of Equivalence and his Special Relativity must hold in sufficiently small finite regions of his gravitational field and that these regions can be located anywhere in his gravitational field (Einstein A. The Meaning of Relativity, Science Paperbacks and Methuen & Co. Ltd., pp. 56--57, 1967) where the Principle of Equivalence and Special Relativity are defined in terms the a priori presence of multiple arbitrarily large finite masses and photons. I also note that you and Sharples make some fanfare that my Reply to Sharples was rejected by the journal Progress in Physics because it exceeded the length of 8 pages imposed by the Journal. It was not rejected for any error in mathematics or in physics. I also point out in my Reply that Sharples has made false statements as to what I have argued and I expose these false statements in my paper, by which he claims that I am mistaken. Sharples has therefore been rather careless with the truth. You have ignored these facts and evidently did not even bother to read my Reply to Sharples to acquire knowledge of my Reply. Furthermore, my paper is long because I quote extensively from the literature so that there can be absolutely no contest as to the contradictions asserted by Einstein and his followers and the errors in mathematics committed by them. Nonetheless, you did not draw any attention to these matters. Here is my full Reply to Sharples once again:

The Black Hole Catastrophe: a Reply to J. J. Sharples,
<http://vixra.org/abs/1011.0062>

I subsequently prepared a shorter reply, here:

The Black Hole Catastrophe: A Short Reply to J. J. Sharples
<http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0032>

I note that Sharples' claims that my development of the form of 3-dimensional metrics with spherical symmetry is incorrect, even though he did not even bother to read the paper beyond the first few lines! Yet you evidently condone his behaviour. His remarks in an attempt to justify his refusal to read my paper in full are patently disingenuous. I refer you again to my paper:

Gravitation on a Spherically Symmetric Metric Manifold
<http://vixra.org/abs/1101.0005>

Why don't you read the paper yourself instead of relying upon the assertions of Sharples who admits he did not even read the paper? My paper is a sound development of the stated geometry from first principles. To verify this I refer you to Section 11. 'Three-dimensional metrics with spherical symmetry' in Chapter XII of the book: Levi-Civita T. The Absolute Differential Calculus, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1977. Recall that T. Levi-Civita was one of the inventors of the Tensor Calculus. Thus Sharples' refusal to read my paper has no scientific basis whatsoever. Evidently you too have not bothered to read my paper or the Reference 1 therein and cited again above. Sharples and you also fail to acknowledge the irrefutable fact that the quantity 'r' appearing in the so-called 'Schwarzschild solution' is neither a radius nor a distance in the associated manifold and so cannot be treated as such; and the irrefutable fact that this 'r' can be replaced by any analytic function of 'r' without violating spherical symmetry or $Ric = 0$ (Eddington A. S., The mathematical theory of relativity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edition, 1960). For example, replace 'r' by $\exp(r)$. Then what is the geometric significance of 'r' and what is the geometric significance of $\exp(r)$ in the resulting metric? What is the admissible range on the quantity 'r'? Where, if any, does a singularity occur in the metric? And what determines the actual radius associated with the metric? All these questions are in fact answered intrinsically by the form of the metric and so this applies to all analytic functions of 'r' that are introduced into the metric because the entire nature of a geometry is fully determined by the form of the metric, as pointed out by R. C. Tolman (Tolman R. C., Relativity Thermodynamics and Cosmology, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1987, Section 15) and that the intrinsic geometry of a surface is completely independent of any embedding space (Efimov N. V., Higher Geometry, Mir Publishers, Moscow, 1980). Thus, all curvature invariants associated with the metric are determined by the metric itself, not by any assumptions foisted upon those curvature invariants as routinely done by the proponents of the black hole. Furthermore, Schwarzschild spacetime actually contains no matter at all, which is easily proved, and so there can be no black hole in the manifold.

Now one can easily prove that the black hole is nonsense without using any mathematics at all. I refer you to these papers:

OPEN LETTER TO PROFESSOR BRIAN SCHMIDT ON HIS ALLEGED
BLACK HOLE IN NOVA SCORPII

<http://vixra.org/abs/1201.0004>

On the Alleged "Black Hole" Binary in Nova Scorpii

<http://viXra.org/abs/1206.0081>

One can also do it in a few pages without using any more than a little senior high school calculus, as shown in this paper:

Proof of no "Black Hole" Binary in Nova Scorpii

<http://viXra.org/abs/1206.0080>

Similarly it is easy to prove that General Relativity is invalid owing to its violation of the usual conservation of energy and momentum, using a bare minimum of tensor calculus and differential geometry, as shown in this paper:

Concerning Big Bang Cosmology, it is invalid by the invalidity of General Relativity. It is also worth noting the following. Cosmology is not a science at all; it is theology. The relativistic cosmologists generally fail to mention to the general public and their students the fact that the Big Bang Cosmology was first conjured up by the Belgian mathematician and priest Georges Lemaitre. Thereby Lemaitre introduced a creation event into the equations of General Relativity and hence infused physics with the notion of God and His creation of the Universe. The Big Bang theory has been ratified by the Vatican owing to Lemaitre's creationism. All Lemaitre did was substitute one creation event with another creation event. Indeed, Lemaitre admitted to the Swedish Nobel Prize winner in physics, Hannes Alfvén, that he came up with the idea to accord with Christian theology and the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Alfvén was not impressed. Here is what Alfvén reported: "I was there when Abbe Georges Lemaitre first proposed this theory," he recalled. Lemaitre was, at the time, both a member of the Catholic hierarchy and an accomplished scientist. He said in private that this theory was a way to reconcile science with St. Thomas Aquinas' theological dictum of *creatio ex nihilo* or creation out of nothing. "There is no rational reason to doubt that the universe has existed indefinitely, for an infinite time," Alfvén explained. "It is only myth that attempts to say how the universe came to be, either four thousand or twenty billion years ago. Since religion intrinsically rejects empirical methods, there should never be any attempt to reconcile scientific theories with religion. An infinitely old universe, always evolving, may not be compatible with the Book of Genesis. However, religions such as Buddhism get along without having any explicit creation mythology and are in no way contradicted by a universe without a beginning or end. *Creatio ex nihilo*, even as religious doctrine, only dates to around AD 200. The key is not to confuse myth and empirical results, or religion and science."

Furthermore, in January 1933, Georges Lemaitre travelled with Albert Einstein to California for a series of seminars. After the Belgian detailed his Big Bang theory, Einstein stood up applauded, and said, "This is the most beautiful and satisfactory explanation of creation to which I have ever listened." So evidently Einstein was actually a creationist, revealing thereby that he too was actually theological in his real disposition, despite his often overt cryptic claims that he was not. Now Big Bang Cosmology only has the façade of science because it is couched in the mantle of complicated, but meaningless, mathematics, in terms of General Relativity which is an invalid theory because it violates the usual conservation of energy and momentum and is therefore in conflict with experiment on a very deep level. Before the Big Bang theory there was actually no alleged 'scientific' basis attached to the question of the creation of the Universe. Only theology dealt with this question then. It still does.

Concerning Einstein's gravitational waves, they are coordinate dependent, contrary to Einstein's requirement that physical phenomena be coordinate independent. Einstein and his followers merely arbitrarily choose a set of coordinates to get a speed of propagation at that of the speed c of light in vacuum as desired. But there is no a priori reason to choose this set of coordinates as all the sets of coordinates have equal validity. Thus Einstein's argument is circular and therefore entirely invalid. It is therefore no wonder that his gravitational waves have not been detected, because they

simply do not exist because gravitational energy cannot be localised in General Relativity, as easily proven in the paper cited above.

I note that C. Corda has now entered the fray. Corda's paper, which I read some time ago, is nothing but a regurgitation of the usual falsehoods associated with the meaningless solution for $\text{Ric} = 0$ and thus of no consequence. Corda too is ignorant of the facts that I have given above and so his arguments are consequently incorrect.

Now I also note that neither you nor Sharples have bothered to even try to prove me wrong by the simple recipe I previously provided to you. Here it is again. Just do the following (C. Corda could try it too).

1. Prove that the Principle of Equivalence and Special Relativity can manifest in a spacetime that by mathematical construction contains no matter, namely $\text{Ric} = 0$.
2. Prove that Einstein's pseudo-tensor is not a meaningless concoction of mathematical symbols (and hence that the field equations do not violate the fundamental principle of the usual conservation of energy and momentum). Recall that according to Einstein the components of his pseudo-tensor are '*the "energy components" of the gravitational field*' (Pauli W., *The Theory of Relativity*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1981) and that his pseudo-tensor "*expresses the law of conservation of momentum and of energy for the gravitational field.*" (Einstein A. *The Foundation of the General Theory of Relativity, Annalen der Physik*, 49, 1916, *The Principle of Relativity: A collection of original memoirs on the special and general theory of relativity*, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1952).

S. J. Crothers
9 August 2012