

# Religious Science

Sjaak Uitterdijk

[SjaakenLutske@hetnet.nl](mailto:SjaakenLutske@hetnet.nl)

*Abstract – The Special Theory of Relativity is a very “popular” theory among physicists, so don’t dare to state that it is a nonsense theory. The most basic reason for the weirdness of this theory is the acceptance by almost all physicists of the fact that the velocity of light in vacuum in this theory is fully undefined.*

## Introduction

A velocity of whatever object or phenomenon is only defined if the reference, with respect to which the object / phenomenon moves, is defined. This forces us to the conclusion that, formally, we should always mention the reference speaking about the velocity of an object or phenomenon. If we mention the velocity of for example a car, everybody knows that we only mean the street as reference and so it is omitted. The speed of an airplane is meant as groundspeed, showing implicitly the reference. By far the greatest part of physicists is satisfied just stating: the velocity of light in vacuum is  $c$ . By far the most unscientific statement in physics.

## Award for the most unscientific statement

A few years ago the young student Ryan Chester did win an award of \$250000 by explaining his way of looking at the STR. See [1].

His crucial statements and my corrections are shown hereafter.

In [1] it is claimed that Einstein’s first postulate sounds:

“The laws of physics are the same in any inertial reference frame”.

Comment:

Einstein’s first postulate is a completely different one, sounding:

*The laws by which the states of physical systems undergo change are not affected, whether these changes of state be referred to the one or the other of two systems of co-ordinates in uniform translatory motion.*

N.B. At that time the concept “inertial system” with the meant property did not yet exist!

Einstein only considers **2** systems, moving with respect to each other with a constant mutual speed.

If we would still call Einstein’s first postulate “The Principle of Relativity”, just as he did himself, then we have to find another expression for the postulate: the laws of physics are the same in any inertial reference frame, now-a-days qualified as “The Principle of Relativity”. See [2] for an alternative expression.

In [1] it is claimed that Einstein's second postulate sounds:

"Light travels at a constant speed in a vacuum regardless of the speed of the source."

Comment:

Einstein's second postulate in his words sounds:

*Any ray of light moves in the "stationary" system of co-ordinates with the determined velocity  $c$ , whether the ray be emitted by a stationary or by a moving body.*

The quotes around the word stationary tell us already that there is something peculiar about this concept. It turns out that Einstein effectively re-introduced an ether equivalent model with this concept. See [2] for the explanation.

Stating the words: "...at a constant speed in a vacuum regardless of the speed of the source of the light..." means effectively that it is tried to define the speed of light with vacuum as the reference.

The source, left as the only other possible reference, has explicitly been excluded by the addition: "regardless of the speed of the source".

As is well known, vacuum just means "nothing".

Conclusion: an undefined speed of light has been created

In [2] it is proven, given the postulate that all physical laws are the same in any inertial system, that the speed of light, emitted by an inertial source in vacuum, is always and only  $c$  with respect to its source.

But hardly any physicist does have any problem stating it as: the velocity of light in vacuum is  $c$ .

Most likely this is the reason that the STR is still considered as the most wonderful theory ever created. And Einstein as the most genius scientist ever born.

## **Encore**

In [2] it is explained that the postulate: The laws of physics are the same in any inertial system, leads to the unavoidable conclusion that all clocks in such systems run with the same speed! Fully in contradiction with Einstein's concept of time dilation.

Conclusion: the concept space-time has to be rejected.

The mentioned conclusions above and the fact that hardly any physicist wants to accept the nonsense of the STR, have forced me to send a letter to the members of the Nobel Committee for Physics. See the attachment

## **References**

- [1] Ryan Chester his view on the STR <https://youtu.be/CYv5GsXEf1o>
- [2] The Principle of Absolute Relativity <http://vixra.org/abs/1611.0111>

## Attachment

Subject: Religious science

date: 8 June 2017

Dear members Nobel Committee Physics,

Would you be so kind to pay attention to the following consideration?

One of the postulates in physics sounds: all physical laws are the same in any inertial system.

A consequence of this postulate is that the time measurement of (atomic) clocks, moving with constant speed, are not influenced by such a speed.

This conclusion is clearly in contradiction with the outcome of the Special Theory of Relativity (STR).

Another consequence of this postulate is that, given the physical laws of Maxwell, the velocity of light in vacuum must be  $c$ , explicitly and only with respect to its inertial source.

This conclusion is flagrantly in contradiction with one of the hypotheses on which the STR is based.

The past decade I have shown thousands of physicists this fundamental proof of the invalidity of the STR.

Those physicists, inclusive Nobel laureates, who tried to contest this evidence, used the most weird and/or non-scientific counter arguments.

They give me the impression that they *believe* in the STR like religious people *believe* in the Koran/Bible.

Publication of my article in magazines/arXiv, designated for this purpose, is impossible. To my opinion due to this religion like believe in the STR.

As a result you will find my article at <http://vixra.org/abs/1611.0111> The Principle of Absolute Relativity.

The described attitude of physicists is of course fatal for physical science, leading to its lowest possible level: science fiction.

I'm looking forward to your opinion about the phenomenon presented above.

Kind regards,

Sjaak Uitterdijk

The Netherlands

FYI:

This e-mail has been received too by 2000 (out of a list of 8000) physicists as blind copy. They are members of the following universities: All in the Netherlands and Belgium, ETH Zürich, Oxford, Cambridge, Imperial College, University College London, Berkeley, Harvard, MIT, Stanford and Cornell. Besides that: Princeton IAS.