

Anti-ethics and pseudoscience: On Albert Einstein's theory of relativity

Yin Zhu(朱寅)

Agriculture Department of Hubei Province, Wuhan, China

waterzhu@163.com

(May 19, 2017)

Abstract

1. All of the conclusions are directly from or based on the arguments and discussions in the researchgate.net. Sometimes, the arguments are very intense and sharp. Till now, these conclusions seem solidly standing.
2. The problems discussed here are easily understood. Only the simple mathematics is used. From the literatures, it is clearly shown that Einstein did have no original work in the theory of relativity. It just is a faked story that Einstein independently presented all the conclusions of the theory of relativity.
3. The conclusions are radically violent. It is certainly declared that Einstein's theory of relativity is only pseudoscience and the pseudoscience is produced from the anti-ethics: Einstein did have no original work in the theory of relativity. But, now, all of the results in the theory of relativity are ascribed to Einstein.
4. General readers may not believe the conclusions. But, as you know that the theory of relativity is filled with faked stories, you should know what it means.
5. The arguments in the researchgate.net showed that, at least, no relativist can disprove the conclusions. And, some of the rational relativists have to agree some of these conclusions. But, most of the relativists only can select silent.
6. Maybe, relativists will close their eyes on the conclusions to continue the declaration that the theory of relativity is a great theory as they did in the past. But, now, it is the internet time. The conclusions cannot be concealed and shielded as did before internet time. Now, they can be generally and quickly spread and transformed. Relativists shall lose their public credibility quickly if they could not have a valid response.
7. We clearly know, it is risk to criticize Einstein. But, the scientists, including relativists, want to know scientific truth. And, we believe, we have the clear and simple arguments. Therefore, we hope, some of the mainstream physicists should accept the conclusions.

Key words: Einstein—Theory of relativity—Anti-ethics—Pseudoscience—Standard model

Introduction

From June of 2016, Einstein's theory of relativity was generally and intensely argued and discussed in the researchgate.net.[1-3] There are more than 50 thousand reads and more than one thousand comments on Refs[1-3]. Some of specialists, including relativists, took part in this arguments and discussions. Here, it is stressed that, the intense and heated arguments make the conclusions solid and certain.

Three main conclusions are arrived at:

First, the key problem of the theory of relativity is unethical. Einstein did have no original work in the theory of relativity. But, all of the equations and conclusions in it are declared to be presented independently by Einstein.[4] So, many stories were faked. Therefore, the biggest and immoralist problem is that the theory of relativity is filled with faked stories.

Second, the scientific problem is that, in the Lorentz transformation, the speed of light along the y' and z' axes in the moving system can be infinite large.[5] The Lorentz transformation is simply wrong. It means that all of the equations and concepts (including the Lorentz metrics, the relative spacetime, the 4 dimensional spacetime and Riemannian metrics and curved spacetime) of the theory of relativity which are based on and analogue to the Lorentz transformation are wrong. And, the experiments showed that the relative and curved spacetime is wrong.[1]

Third, the determined problem is that Einstein's relative and curved spacetime has not been and cannot be used to invent any new production. It is known by almost everybody, if a production was invented with Einstein's relative and curved spacetime, it should mean that it is a scientific theory.[6] Therefore, to argue that the theory of relativity is a great theory, it was faked that the GPS need be corrected with the Hafele-keating experiment. But, the Hafele-keating experiment is not credible.[7,8]

It is stressed that, all of the conclusions are only on the researchgate.net. They have not been accepted by the main part of mainstream physicists. It means that, to clarify a scientific theory on internet become significant. Before internet time, these conclusions cannot be published in any mainstream scientific journal. They are easily concealed and shielded. Thus, the arguments showing the mistakes in the theory of relativity cannot be known

generally. On the internet, the information can be easily and generally spread and transformed. As soon as a reader know that Einstein did have no original work of the theory of relativity, this reader shall realize that he was cheated by the author who declared that Einstein independently presented all of the conclusions in the theory of relativity. Therefore, although in the past 110 years the theory of relativity can be declared as a very great theory under the condition that many people presented the evidences to disprove it, the status should be changed in the internet time for that, for example, it is very easy to know that Einstein did have no original work.

It is also stressed that the arguments of the theory of relativity need be fair and public. In this status, the problems and mistakes in the theory of relativity can be easily clarified. So, with public discussion and argument,[1-5] the problems and mistakes of the theory of relativity revealed and disclosed in almost one year are much more than that have been done in the past 110 years.

Basic scientific problems

A. In the Lorentz transformation, the speed of light can be infinite large[5]

This is a very simple mathematics problem. It can be understood by a high school student. We know, the Lorentz transformation is valued as the law of other physics law: The result obtained from other laws need be accordant with the Lorentz transformation. So, I suggest that, the readers should read the Ref.[5] first.

B. Experiments for faster-than-light

Now, in the mainstream physical society, it was certainly known that the nonlocality was measured in quantum physics.[9] It was measured that the speed of the spooky action at a distance is larger than $10 \times 10^4 c$ [10,11]. And, any finite speed v with $c < v < \infty$ predicting correlations can be exploited for faster-than-light communication.[12] In addition, it was observed that the speed of gravitational force is much faster than light or instantaneous and the energy and momentum of one celestial body acting on another one can be transferred with this speed.[13]

C. The accelerator shows that Einstein's relative spacetime is wrong[1]

(In an accelerator,) The velocity of a particle is determined with $v=at$. a is the acceleration which

is determined with an electric field or both electric and magnetic fields. a usually can be treated as constant. Thus, the last velocity of this particle is determined with the accelerated time t . If Einstein's time dilation was true, the time for accelerating a particle is $t' = t\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$. v is usually very large. Thus, there should be two different velocities for the particles. And, two kinds of different new particles should be produced respectively corresponding to t and t' or to v and v' .

And, as the length become shorter and the time become slower, the line of the particles running must be different from that as these factors are determined with absolute space and time. Thus, how can the particles run in a circular accelerator which is designed only with the absolute space and time?

(Note: In all of the work, the italic words are directly copied from the numbered **References**.)

D. About $E=mc^2$ and atomic bomb

$E = mc^2$ is first presented by Olinto De Pretto[14] in 1903 after several physicists researched it experimentally and theoretically.[15] And, Einstein had never obtained it with a right derivation.[16] And, it is Ernest Rutherford who discovered the concept of radioactive half-life, proved that radioactivity involved the nuclear transmutation of one chemical element to another, and led to the first "splitting" of the atom in 1917 in a nuclear reaction between nitrogen and alpha particles. So, it mainly is Rutherford's works leading to the atomic bomb.[17]

E. GPS and the Hafele-keating experiment

The Hafele-keating experiment is incredible for two reasons: First, the time on the accurate and precession of nanoseconds cannot be measured in a shocking and vibrating plane.[7] Second, the Newtonian gravitational force has an effect on an atomic clock which is much larger than Einstein's time dilation on it.[8] But, in all of the Hafele-keating experiments, this effect was not considered.

F. A simple review of general relativity

This is an original comment in Ref. [2]

1. It is Gunnar Nordström[18-20] who first presented to describe gravity with curved space. Einstein did not have original work in the theory of relativity.

2. *Einstein's curved spacetime has not been and cannot be used to design an orbit of a real artificial spacecraft/satellite. Relativists may argue that it can. But, they cannot argue that the curved spacetime has been used to design an orbit.*
3. *In fact, it cannot. To use the Einstein's field theory designing an orbit, the Einstein gravitational time dilation must be used. But, the Hafele-keating experiment is incredible for two reasons: First, the time on the level of nanosecond cannot be measured in a vibrating and shocking plane. Second, the Newtonian gravitational force has an effect on the atoms in an atomic clock. This effect is much larger than Einstein gravitational time dilation. But, it has never been considered in the Hafele-keating experiments.*
4. *An orbit of a planet is usually perturbed by many factors. It is described with the Lagrange' planetary equation which express Newtonian gravitational force and other force. The curved spacetime cannot be expressed with the Lagrange' planetary equation.*
5. *The precession of perihelion of Mercury is perturbed by the oblateness of the Sun. It has never been mentioned in the textbook of a general relativity. This perturbation cannot be explained by Einstein's general relativity. It only can be explained with Newtonian theory of gravity.*

G. The determined argument: Einstein's relative and curved spacetime is futile[1]

For classic and quantum physics, there are five characteristics: 1) It is a system that has been experimentally confirmed. 2) It can be used to study a certain kind of object. 3) A series of sub-theory has been developed from and based on it. 4) Many new techniques have been developed from it. 5) Many new productions have been invented and produced from it. But, till now, Einstein's theory of space and time has not been practically used in any one area as a general theory of physics. This is a crucial problem.

This problem has been noted by many of relativists. But, the relativists have not questioned the theory. Instead, they faked a use for the theory: They claimed that Einstein's theory of space and time can be used for GPS.

Who I will write this subject for?

First, I will write this for the students and younger people. Maybe, they cannot understand all of the conclusions. But, they should know some of the facts, such as that Einstein did have no original work and Einstein's theory of spacetime has not been and cannot be used to invent a new production.

Second, I will write for the relativists. Two original comments[1] are the reasons:

Are you an honest people?

As an expert of accelerator, you know that the time in an accelerator is not relative as declared in the theory of relativity. Therefore, it is your duty to tell everyone the fact. Or, you are purposive to cheat others.

Maybe, you could prove that the time in an accelerator is relative. Then, please prove it so.

If you should care about your duty and credit, please answer this question.

If you are an honest people, please answer:

Are the time and length in an accelerator relative?

What is the speed of light along the y' and z' axes in the moving system in the cited reference?[5]

It is certain, it is the duty of the relativists to have a scientific reply about the conclusions for general readers. Or, they are purposive to cheat. Maybe, a sharp and intense words is not a good selection to arrive at a common view. But, sometimes, some of people like to use such words to attack the people who presented the mistakes in the theory of relativity. Here, the kinds of words show that the conclusions were arrived at from very intense and heated arguments. It is a supported evidence to show that the conclusions cannot be disproven by relativists.

Third, I will write for all of other scientists. The scientific problems discussed here and the cited references are very simple. It can be easily understood and clarified by a trained scientist in any area of science. For example, the mistake in the Lorentz transformation can be easily understood by a high school student.

Why the mistakes in the theory of relativity have not been known previously or Who are the supporters of Einstein?

The main and biggest group of the supporters of the theory of relativity is the general physicists. Normally, a general physicist need obtain a doctor degree to finish the study of the course of the theory of relativity. At this time, a general people is almost 30 years old. But, today, the physical science is developed as a very complicated and big system. A people with Ph.D. degree is usually unable to have an independent research. It means that this people is very difficult to understand the whole system of physics well. It is very important, as a people is 30 years, his/her mind is usually stereotyped or labelled. And, the theory of relativity is declared as the greatest theory. There are many difficult equations and concepts which are declared that only can be understood by the smartest and

cleverest people. It is a mental orientation for the general people. It makes that, in subconscious, the general people will omit the mistakes in the theory of relativity which they can easily find in other place. For example, it was generally known that Einstein's derivations for obtaining the main conclusions in the theory of relativity are wrong. It can be easily concluded that Einstein faked his conclusions. But, it was declared as a "Failings of Genius".[21] At the same time, to show the mistakes in this theory of relativity is risk or, at least, not helpful for the job of a researcher. Only very little people will endeavor effort to find out the mistakes. Therefore, a general people has to select to believe the declaration about the theory of relativity. Because the theory of relativity is considered as one of the greatest theory, many people are proud of that they have studied it. For example, in the discussions, many people like to use the equations and concepts of the theory of relativity which are the current words in today's physics. But,[2]

As a physicist claimed that the precession of perihelion of Mercury proved that Einstein's curved spacetime is right, this physicist has never known that the orbit of Mercury is perturbed by the oblateness of the Sun which cannot be explained with Einstein's curved spacetime. In the initial textbooks, it is taught that Einstein's field equations only can be used to solve the problem of a standard sphere. Therefore, this physicist only was cheat by a current declaration. Unfortunately, this physicist transfers this cheat to the readers and students although not purposively.

Why did not Einstein win the Nobel Prize for his theory of relativity?

This question was presented many times by many people. It is clear, this question is presented under the condition that these people believe that all of the conclusions in the theory of relativity are Einstein's original works. If it is known that Einstein did have no original work, this question should not be produced. It is certain, the people in the Einstein's time knew this fact well. Therefore, it is easy to understand that the Nobel Prize have not been awarded to Einstein for the theory of relativity. But, the fact is that, some of results in the theory of relativity are worth of Nobel Prize although the relative and curved spacetime are simply wrong. It is certain and clear, in any standard, $E = mc^2$ and $m = m_0/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ need a Nobel Prize. But, they were not awarded. And, more seriously, the two equations are ascribed to Einstein. The names of the true original workers of them are concealed and replaced. This is a serious ethical problem.

And, there is an analogous case. The Lorentz force is clearly and certainly worth of a Nobel Prize. But, H. Lorentz himself had not won the Nobel Prize for the Lorentz force, but for the Zeeman effect.

I have not had sufficient literatures to know the reasons. But, it shows some of ethical problems in that time. It can only be clarified with more historical literatures in futures.

Is Einstein a plagiarism?

As you input “Einstein” and “plagiarism” in google or being.com, many results shall emerge at once. It means that many people think that Einstein is a plagiarism. But, we think, it is too simple to call Einstein a plagiarism although it is certain that Einstein did have no original work. In fact, all of the content that Einstein used in his theory of relativity are the most current ones that was being studied by many mainstream physicists in that time. Therefore, the content in Einstein’s paper are well known by the original workers. But, there is no evidence to show that the physicists in that time thought that Einstein is a plagiarism. (Maybe, it cannot be excluded that such kinds of evidences were shielded.) Therefore, we cannot simply say that Einstein is a plagiarism.

What is the reason that made Einstein “the greatest physicist”?

But, why now all of the conclusions in the theory of relativity are ascribed to Einstein? This is a very very complicated problem. Here, we cannot give the problems a complete explanation. But, we still try to show a main line for it.

Before 1919, Einstein with his theory of relativity had not been generally noted. In 1919, light bending by gravity during the Sun eclipse was observed by A. Edington. From this observation, in the newspaper, it is declared that Einstein is one of the greatest physicists. His theory of relativity overcome Newtonian theory.

From 1919, there are two lines to shape Einstein’s image: The non-scientific media, including newspaper, radio, TV, movie and magazines and the scientific books and journals. In the non-scientific media, Einstein is declared a very great physicist who independently presented all the conclusions in the theory of relativity and all the conclusion are well proven experimentally. The theory of relativity is such a theory that is greater than Newtonian theory. While in the scientific books,[15] the original workers were detailedly introduced. Unfortunately, the sound of scientific books and journals is covered by that of non-scientific ones. For example, in the discussions in Ref.[2], even the leading specialist does not know that it is not Einstein who first presented the curvature of space.

The non-scientific media played a very important even determined role in declaring the theory of relativity. It radically misled the current physics. All of the faked stories are first presented by it. Unfortunately, as pointed out

in the above, because general physicists very difficultly understand the whole physics, they have to accept the declaration from the non-scientific media. Therefore, in some of scientific books, the faked stories become main content. Worse, in recent, in scientific papers and books, some of the content that were not related to the theory of relativity now are related to it.

In another hand, the scientific journals are dominated by the authorities who reject to publish the papers that are not accordant with theory of relativity. And, as pointed above, some people who are worth of Nobel Prize but did not obtained. Is this a reason that covered the real sounds about the theory of relativity?

In 2007, the Nature published a news: “Arthur Eddington was innocent!”[22] Eddington’s work in 1919 made the newspaper declare that Einstein’s theory of relativity overcome Newtonian theory. But, in 2007, it is still argued whether Eddington was innocent. The anti-ethics is clear. The effect of the non-scientific media on the science and scientists also is clear.

Einstein’s default

However, Einstein himself had default in this problem. First, in all of his papers, the original workers had never been introduced. It results in that it is easy to think that it is Einstein himself who independently presented these conclusions. Second, more seriously, as proven in Ref[5], in the Lorentz transformation, the speed of light can be infinite large, therefore, all of the equations in Einstein works are wrong. It means that, Einstein faked the results in all of his works. This is a very very serious problem. It is noted, it was presented that Einstein’s derivations of Lorentz transformation,[5] $E=mc^2$, [16] additional law of velocities[23] and the precession of perihelion of the Mercury,[2] are wrong. And, in a widespread book “Einstein's Mistakes: The Human Failings of Genius”, [21] it was shown that, Einstein made 23 mistakes in mathematics, almost including all of the main conclusions in his theory of relativity. But, from the wrong derivations, he just obtained the current (in that time) conclusions. Logically, no one can always obtain right conclusions from wrong derivations. So, this cannot be a “Failings of Genius”. Now, it was shown[1,2,4,5,9-13,22] that some of the current (in that time) conclusions are wrong. Therefore, we only can conclude that Einstein faked his conclusions.

An alternative theory needed?

This is an original comment in Ref. [2]

Some of the relativists have to accept that there are crucial problems in the theory of relativity.

But, they claimed that an alternative theory is needed if one should reject the theory of relativity. This is a simple sophistry. But, many people are confused and puzzled by it.

As a physicist claimed that the precession of perihelion of Mercury proved that Einstein's curved spacetime is right, this physicist has never known that the orbit of Mercury is perturbed by the oblateness of the Sun which cannot be explained with Einstein's curved spacetime. In the initial textbooks, it is taught that Einstein's field equations only can be used to solve the problem of a standard sphere. Therefore, this physicist only was cheat by a current declaration. Unfortunately, this physicist transfers this cheat to the readers and students although not purposively. Then, what is the exact meanings for the alternative to the theory of relativity? A theory that continues this cheat?

The Lorentz transformation is wrong. Thus, the equations and concepts based on it, including the Lorentz metrics, the 4 Dimensional spacetime, and that analogue to it, including the Riemannian metrics and curved spacetime, are wrong. It means that, the basic equations and concepts in the theory of relativity are wrong.

It is determined, till now, the theory of relativity has not been and cannot be used to invent any new production.

Then, why we need an alternative theory to the theory of relativity?

It is more serious, the theory of relativity radically mislead the development of physics. For example, many best physicists spent all of their life to explain an experimentally test the precession of perihelion of Mercury. But, the orbit of the Moon around the Earth only can be explained by very little physicists. Please see: [30]

Misled physics

First, in 1600, Sir Isaac Newton and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz respectively discovered (differential and integral) calculus. It made the physics radically advanced. From that time, mathematics has had a great impress to physicists. Some people make great effort to discover new mathematics and some think that everything can be solved with mathematics. Second, the space is mystery. Till now, we have not understood it although the time can be explained in physics and philosophy.[24,25] But, from 1755, Joseph-Louis Lagrange[26] presented that

mechanics can be viewed as operating in a four-dimensional space — three dimensions of space, and one of time. Before 1900, the high dimensional space speculation was widespread. It was tried to employ the high dimensional space speculation into mathematics and physics. Third, before 1900, it is a very free time to discuss and to explore new science. Many new theories, including Darwin's theory of evolution, were presented. Many new theory of physics also were presented in that time. But, unfortunately, some of the wrong and unproven hypotheses were widespread. For example, although without experimental evidence, that the speed of light is a limit speed, the 4-diminsional space, and so on, were generally believed by the mainstream physical society in that time. Therefore, a new theory is needed to combine these concepts. Just by chance, Einstein put these unconfirmed hypotheses in his works with wrong derivation in mathematics. And, in that time, physicists generally thought that they could surpass Newton. In 1904, Poincaré [27] sentenced:

Perhaps likewise, we should construct a whole new mechanics, that we only succeed in catching a glimpse of, where inertia increasing with the velocity, the velocity of light would become an impassable limit.

The ordinary mechanics, more simply, would remain a first approximation, since it would be true for velocities not too great, so that one would still find the old dynamics under the new.

But, now, we know, it is difficult to factually surpass Newton. Physicists in that time knew that they need strong evidence to make these concepts as a new mechanics that can surpass Newton. Till 1919, they thought that they had such an evidence.

In 1919, it was declared that the light bending by gravity during the Sun eclipse was measured.[4,22] From that time, it was declared that Einstein's theory of relativity overcome Newtonian theory. It is certain, this is very abused. Light bending by gravity is first predicted by Newton. Then, that light bending by gravity overcome Newtonian theory factually just means that Newton overcome Newton. It is clear, that light bending by gravity is predicted by Newton means that it has nothing to do with curved space. But, it was taken as a strong evidence to show the curved space. How absurd a story! But,[4]

in a long time, as we are children, we are taught by the most authoritative physicists and books that Einstein is the greatest physicist for that he individually originated the theory of relativity. And, we successively teach these to our children and students. But, as a teacher tell his students that Einstein's "On the electrodynamics of moving bodies" is one of the greatest paper; the teacher is factually cheating the students although this teacher is not purposive. It is the fact that, every day, many teachers taught the

students that Einstein originally presented many great theories. Factually, this is successive, extensive and authoritative cheat on the students. If the problem of Einstein and the theory of relativity cannot be clarified, this kinds of cheat shall be continued.

Today, the theory of relativity is mixed with these concepts: the invariance of speed of light, the Lorentz transformation, the relative, curved and high dimensional spacetime. From the theory of relativity, some of physicists believe that the mathematics and spacetime structure dominate the law of physics. Some of the equations are so elegant that can be purely theoretical theory confirmation.[28] It becomes a current way to obtain a physical conclusion by the induction and derivation of some equations of spacetime structure. Unfortunately, the most puzzled and difficult subject for these physicists is just the mathematics and the so called spacetime structure: In a long time, the wrong Lorentz transformation is valued as the law of other physics laws. However, a well-trained scientist knows that any scientific theory need be proven experimentally. Or, the door should be opened for pseudoscience.[29] And, as listed above, we know, in the Lorentz transformation, the speed of light can be infinite large. Therefore, all of these equations of the spacetime structure are wrong. Today, some of the physicists knew that physics is in crunch and presented whether it is time to ditch the theory of relativity.[6] And, as physicists claimed that Einstein's general relativity can be used to explain the whole universe, only little of them can explain the orbit of the Moon around the Earth.[30] It is clear, the orbit of the Moon is a basic problem which need be understood by a high school student. While it cannot be explained with the theory of relativity. It means that, in current physics, the basic problem and the observation/experiment are neglected. And, the complicated equations of the spacetime structure is useless to solve a simple true physical problem. Furthermore, the superstring is claimed the most leading and frontier theory. It is believed that it is the theory for everything. But, as we know that the superstring theory is based on the hypothesis of the extra dimension which was presented in 1914 by Gunnar Nordström,[20] we should know that the current physicists have known little about mathematics and the theory for everything.

It is noted that, the scientific standard is omitting or regardless of in the theory of relativity. A apparent sign is the book "The Bible According to Einstein: A Scientific Complement to the Holy Bible for the Third Millennium".[31]

However, The Bible only need be believed while the science need be doubted and questioned. Without doubt and question, science shall be dying. So, the book "The Bible According to Einstein" is making physics far from science if it is not making pseudoscience.[5]

Unfortunately, this book was reviewed by many very famous physicists. It shows the reason why the known mistakes in the theory of relativity cannot be revealed. This reason resulted in such a status that the mistakes in the theory of relativity cannot be made public for more than 100 years.

A simple review of the standard model

In the standard model, the spin is a main role. With spin, the particles are classified in two families of fermions and bosons. Those particles with half-integer spins, such as $1/2, 3/2, 5/2$, are known as fermions, while those particles with integer spins, such as $0, 1, 2$, are known as bosons. The interactive force is carried by the bosons which make the fermions unified together.

The spin is thought to be an effect of the theory of relativity. It usually can be described with the Dirac equations. In the Dirac equation, $m = m_0/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$ is very important. But, as known by some people,[32] in $m = m_0/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$, according to the principle of relativity, v need be different to different observers. It requires that the particles produced in an accelerator are different relative to different observers. However, this is not true. Therefore, this equation is contradicted with the principle of relativity. But, we will not say that this equation is wrong or invalid. It is valid experimentally. In an accelerator, the energy of a high speed particle is increased with it and no observation showed that the speed of particles is faster than light. Therefore, we call it empirical equation. We know, in the developing theory of a science, there are usually the empirical equations which are very useful to develop a science. At last, some of them are developed as fundamental formula while some have to be abandoned. Therefore, the Dirac equation also is an empirical equation. From the solution of negative energy of Dirac equation, Dirac presented the positron (antielectron). But, we prefer to think, Dirac only guessed it and he is very lucky to have a right guess. However, today, it is known that the energy of a positron is not negative. Therefore, the explanation of the spin with the Dirac equation only is empirical.

It is certain, a model that is based on empirical equations cannot be standard. Factually, the fundamental problem cannot be explained with the so-called standard model. In any standard, the gravitational force are very analogous to the electrodynamic one. Both of them can be attractive force which are determined with the Inverse-square law. But, in the standard model, the two kinds of force cannot be unified while the electromagnetic force was unified with the weak interaction. We have never understood why the weak interaction is a force for that we have never known that the weak interaction can be an attractive force.

In recent, experiments[33,34] showed that the spin of both the photon and electron can be ± 1 and $\pm 1/2$.

Therefore, the classification of the fermions and bosons with spin is questioned. It means that the foundation of the standard model is not solid.

But, we do not think that the current standard model is nonsense radically. Just as other empirical formula, this model is useful to develop physics and to help us to understand physics well. The question is that we cannot take such a model as standard one or as the final theory which can be a theory for everything. In different civilizations, different time and different subjects, there are used to different kinds of standard model or final theories. But, after the emergence of science, these final theories were submitted to the science. It is satirized, now the final theory occurs in the physical science.

It is the nature of the standard model or final theory to reject or to kill new idea. For example, the Heliocentrism even killed the supporter of the new idea, Nicolaus Copernicus. Without exception, all of the standard model or final theory made the development of science slow or stopped. And, a great development of science usually comes after a standard model or final theory was broken.

Factually, we have known little about the world. We have a very big distance from the final theory. In physics, if we know a very little about the nature, we shall have a very big step in the human history. For example, Faraday's law of induction changed the world much greater in the 180 years than in the early several thousands. If we can manipulate the gravitational field as manipulated the electromagnetic field, the world shall have been a much greater changed. But, the standard model can tell us nothing about it. And, much worse, as an empirical model is valued to be final theory, it must result in pseudoscience.

And, it is noted that, before the Michelson-Morey experiment in 1887, the Ether Theory was the "standard model" or theory for everything. In a long time, every subject need be explained with the Ether. And, some great results, including the Maxwell equations, $E = mc^2$ and $m = m_0/\sqrt{1 - v^2/c^2}$, are first based on the Ether Theory. However, now, the Ether Theory was abandoned apparently.

Conclusion

Many people have presented many mistakes and problems in the theory of relativity. Maybe, here, it is the first time to present that the theory of relativity just is a pseudoscience or a faked story. This conclusion is based on the understanding of the whole physics system. Here, not only the mistakes in the theory of relativity are pointed out, but also the modern physics is discussed from history to frontier. I had a work "The principle of mathematics

and physics” in which the analogous problems were studied in academic words. The two works can be complementary to each other. The mathematical and professional problem is discussed in Ref.[35] For example, in [35], it is shown detailedly that the extra dimension is not a right mathematics concept. We think, we presented useful lines to understand the whole system of physics and new perspective to review some of experiments and theories/hypotheses.

I clearly know that, it is a big risk to show the mistakes of the theory of relativity. So, although I knew the mistakes of the theory of relativity in early time, I did not spend my main work on this subject. Now, I have this work mainly for the reason: In the researchgate.net, the theory of relativity is deeply discussed and heatedly argued to have arrived at certain and solid conclusions.[1-5]

Should the mainstream physical society accept the conclusions? Now, I cannot know. But, in the discussions and arguments in Refs.[1-5], I found that, a physicists can easily understand the arguments listed in the section of “**Basic scientific problems**”. And, we believe, all of scientists want to know the scientific truth. So, I hope, the conclusions should be accepted by some of the learned people.

Science need doubt and question. According to Karl Popper,[36] a scientific theory is always open to falsification. As new evidence is known, a scientific theory need be reconsidered. The development of science showed that many generally accepted theories were given up. In a developing theory, the frontier of this theory is usually made up of hypotheses and conjectures. And, the development of science is to prove and disprove these hypotheses and conjectures. So, in the frontier, many of the hypotheses or accepted “theories” were given up. In physics, after the Michelson-Morey experiment, the Ether Theory that is thought a fundamental theory was given up. Therefore, no people can assure that none of the current physics theory shall be given up.

In another hand, if there is a taboo against doubting or discussing a science subject, the wrong hypotheses and conjectures cannot be given up. The pseudoscience shall certainly be produced. Only the pseudoscience is afraid of being doubted and argued. Normally, doubt and argument are welcomed by all of the scientists. But, unfortunately, it seems that it is difficult to publish a paper doubting or questioning the theory of relativity in a scientific journal. Even, there are some risks to pointed out the problems and mistakes in the theory of relativity.

It is absurd to regard a people who did not have original work as the greatest physicist. Now, it is shown that Einstein faked the derivation of the Lorentz transformation,[5] $E=mc^2$, [16] additional law of velocities, [23] the precession of perihelion of the Mercury [2] and other conclusions. [21] It should be disgrace if we still argued that

Einstein is the greatest physicist and the theory of relativity is the greatest theory of physics. If we shall have modern physics greatly developed, both the pseudoscientist and pseudoscience must be discarded.

At last, it is emphasized again, the theory of relativity need be argued and discussed in a public and fair status. Now, the status is still not fair. For example, if that Einstein faked his results could be argued and discussed in a famous scientific journal, the mistakes in the theory of relativity should be clarified much more quickly.

References

- [1] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304452351_Einstein%27s_theory_of_spacetime_is_wrong?ev=prf_pub
- [2] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312118218_Free_Fall_in_Gravitational_Theory?_sg=q4FK0mjs7DjhMmc_UdVnMWAndkosv96NkdenF4rhHBq_IGrLHX9-90TpLJLYq0NLIKen202hAbtAYISSxCol-2GuY7rvZqJA2mx5gGyGqj8XNmGvspINgs-VNMGH-Mtr6Pz2llu&_icp%5Bcontexts%5D%5B0%5D-prf%5E_icp%5BintentionType%5D-publicationTitle
- [3] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305260245_Notes_on_the_Meaning_of_Einstein%27s_Special_Theory_of_Relativity
- [4] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305355323_Pseudoscience_and_the_distorted_and_wrong_information_about_Einstein_and_the_theory_of_relativity?ev=prf_pub
- [5] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313822831_Contradiction_between_invariance_of_speed_of_light_and_Lorentz_transformation
- [6] J. Bekenstein, Physics crunch: Time to discard relativity? https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257092601_Trouble_with_physics_Time_to_discard_relativity
- [7] https://www.researchgate.net/post/Is_the_Hafele-keating_experiment_credible
- [8] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292970880_A_comparison_between_Newtonian_gravitational_time_effect_and_Einstein%27s_gravitational_time_dilation?ev=prf_pub
- [9] Aspect A., Closing the Door on Einstein and Bohr's Quantum Debate, *Physics* 8, 123 (2015)
- [10] D. Salart, A. Baas, C. Branciard, N. Gisin & H. Zbinden, Testing the speed of 'spooky action at a distance', *Nature* 454, 861-864 (2008)
- [11] J. Yin, et al, Lower Bound on the Speed of Nonlocal Correlations without Locality and Measurement Choice Loopholes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 110, 260407 (2013)
- [12] J.-D. Bancal, et al, Quantum non-locality based on finite-speed causal influences leads to superluminal signalling, *Nature Physic*, 8, 867-870 (2012)
- [13] Y. Zhu, Measurement of the speed of gravity, arxiv:1108.3761v7
- [14] Bartocci U., Albert Einstein e Olinto De Pretto—La vera storia della formula più famosa del mondo, editore Andromeda, Bologna, 1999
- [15] Rosser W.G.V., *An Introduction to the Theory of Relativity* (Butterworths, London, 1971)
- [16] Ohanian H. C., Einstein's $E = mc^2$ mistakes, arxiv:0805.1400
- [17] Badash L., "Rutherford, Ernest", *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (online ed.), Oxford University Press (2008)

- [18] Nordström G., Relativitätsprinzip und Gravitation, 1912, Physikalische Zeitschrift
- [19] Nordström G., Träge und Schwere Masse in der Relativitätsmechanik, 1913, Annalen der Physik
- [20] Nordström G., Zur Elektrizitäts- und Gravitationstheorie, 1914, in the series Öfversigt
- [21] Ohanian H. C., Einstein's Mistakes: The Human Failings of Genius
- [22] Ball P., Arthur Eddington was innocent! Nature, 27/09/2007. <http://www.nature.com/news/2007/070903/full/news070903-20.html>
- [23] Engelhardt W., On the origin of the lorentz transformation, arXiv: 1303.5309
- [24] Prigogine I., & Stengers I., Order out of Chaos: Man's new dialogue with nature
- [25] Hawking S., A brief history of time
- [26] Bell E.T. , Men of Mathematics (1st ed.). New York, Simon and Schuster. p. 154 (1965)
- [27] H. Poincaré, Monist. **15**, 1 (1905)
- [28] Dawid R., underdetermination and theory succession from the perspective of string theory, Phil. Sci. 73, 298–332 (2007)
- [29] <http://www.nature.com/news/scientific-method-defend-the-integrity-of-physics-1.16535>
- [30] https://www.researchgate.net/post/What_does_it_mean_as_the_orbit_of_the_Moon_around_the_Earth_can_only_be_explained_by_very_little_physicists
- [31] Samuel C. C., et al, The Bible According to Einstein, Jupiter Scientific Publishing C.; 1st Ed. (1999)
- [32] https://www.researchgate.net/post/In_Einstein_special_and_general_relativity_does_the_mass_changeDepending_on_the_observers_standpoint?_sg=FO6CLV85xhKNfEEpSvoC_7fPqZM731Ocsfv&do5_kSFEeY_2f5N6NzWdDTQITqWSOjpSNvWFEA0htK4EM3kX5UUTbYxxfZw6QpwA5O9xpxQ1cazmNCHKzL
- [33] Ballantine K. E., Donegan J. F., Eastham P. R., There are many ways to spin a photon: Half-quantization of a total optical angular momentum, Science Advances, 2(4), e1501748 (2016)
- [34] Auböck G., Chergui M., Sub-50-fs photoinduced spin crossover in [Fe (bpy) 3] 2+, Nature chem., 7(8), 629–633 (2015)
- [35] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278113184_The_Principle_of_Physics_and_Mathematics
- [36] Popper K., Conjectures and Refutations