

ESSAY 114: REFUTATIONS OF THE STANDARD VIEW OF PERIHELION PRECESSION.

Written by Myron Evans and narrated by Robert Cheshire

There have been many conclusive refutations of Einsteinian general relativity (EGR), notably in the UFT series on www.aias.us but also by several other authors, several of them famous scientists such as Schwarzschild, Schroedinger and Levi Civita. It is well known now that the standard model of physics is in reality the assertions of dogmatists who ignore scientific advances for anthropomorphic reasons. The knowledge revolution has made it impossible to censor the march of ideas, even in the most conservative of all professions, natural philosophy, or “physics” as it is known.

So EGR cannot explain perihelion precession, despite the dogmatic claims, oft repeated, that it does so with precision. It does no such thing, in many of the UFT papers it has been shown that it produces an orbit which is wildly incorrect. This can be shown simply by plotting the orbit over the complete range of the plane polar coordinates. In other words attention is not restricted to the tiny seconds of arc of the observed planetary precession, but is extended to the entire 360 degrees. Once this is done the Einstein theory produces a wild, divergent orbit, which is total nonsense. A theory cannot be right and at the same time wrong. The dogmatists remain mesmerized by the second of arc region, and like ostriches ignore the appalling reality bearing down upon them. A Titanic that ignores the ice warnings. Scientists as opposed to dogmatists must devise a new theory, as explained in Essay 113. An orbit observed in astronomy never diverges.

The collision with the iceberg has sunk the Einstein theory, but when it comes to perihelion precession there is a lot wrong, also, with the experimental methods. The problem is that almost all the precession is due to the gravitation of other planets, which can be explained with Newtonian theory. Only a very tiny fraction of the complete precession remains unexplained. Einstein focussed on this anomaly and simply assumed that it had been correctly calculated by the astronomers of the era prior to him, the late nineteenth century. He applied his then new theory of general relativity ONLY to the anomaly, i.e. to the tiny fraction of the total precession that cannot be explained by Newtonian methods.

He should have applied his general relativity to explain the entire precession, and should have replaced the Newtonian methods in every context with his new general relativity. It is not logical, and not correct, to apply Newtonian methods to one part of the precession and Einsteinian general relativity only to a tiny anomaly. Even the largest anomaly, that of Mercury, is only forty three seconds of arc per century. This drastic flaw in Einstein’s method was first pointed out by Miles Mathis, who was predictably ridiculed by the desperate dogmatists. Ridicule is not logic, and ridicule is unscientific. In fact Miles Mathis is perfectly right.

So the groupthink of the late and unlamented dogmatic era is essentially a wildly incorrect orbit applied to data as shaky as an earthquake. It is claimed that mythology produces pristine precision. The media blasts this out all over the TV to people who have no idea of what physics is all about, and to whom mathematics is a kind of disease.

The x theory produced during the course of ECE theory gives a precession, which appears to be accurate, and gives rise to the fractal conic sections. It produces a force law that is completely different from that of Einsteinian general relativity, based on the fabled “Schwarzschild metric” of the misty mythology. This object was certainly never produced by Schwarzschild. In truth he crushed Einstein’s theory in December 1915. The x theory works well for all observed precessions and also produces light deflection by gravitation and all else attributed to Einstein. However, orbital precession due to ECE2 special relativity is preferred

to x theory because the former does not use any modelling at all, it uses the lagrangian and hamiltonian of special relativity, and nothing else.

In conclusion all that can be said at present is that special relativity produces precession. It should be applied to the entire precession of planets and in fact to all the phenomena of astronomy. This is work for the future and this is the way to replace Newtonian theory. After all the time dilatation predictions of special relativity are accurate to many orders of magnitude.