

ESSAY 62: On the Errors in Einstein's Theory of Perihelion Precession.

Albert Einstein invited my co-author of four books, Jean-Pierre Vigi er, to work with him at Princeton, and from conversations with Vigi er the latter had plenty of respect for the former. However, in some of his last papers, particularly those on the Sagnac effect, Vigi er too rejected general relativity. The first rejection of Einstein's work was made by Karl Schwarzschild in a letter to Einstein dated December 22nd., 1915, barely a month after the publication of Einstein's theory of perihelion precession. The letter is available on the web together with an analysis by Vankov, an analysis which shows several errors by Einstein, errors in addition to the one discovered by Schwarzschild, who informed Einstein of it by letter. This error is in the solution of the latter's then new field equation, and Schwarzschild corrected it with the real or authentic line element of Schwarzschild, one that does not lead to big bang or black holes.

When I started the development of unified field theory in early 2003 I was unaware of the fact that the Einsteinian general relativity (EGR) is incorrect. I realized immediately however that Einstein had omitted torsion, and gradually it became clear that the whole theory must collapse like a pack of cards. The problem that faces others and myself, critics of Einstein, is his elevation to iconic status, so that any critic is branded as a nut. Very few understand the mathematics of general relativity, and of those that do, the great majority base their work on a geometry that incorrectly omits torsion. The omission of torsion is a fundamental mistake, not an approximation. We are constantly being told of the precision of general relativity, and that does great harm to science. The theory is wrong, and can never have been shown to be right experimentally. This brings into question the basic honesty of the people who keep telling us these things, and that threatens the integrity of the subject itself.

A turning point in my attitude towards EGR occurred in the widely studied UFT88 on www.aias.us. This paper deals with the second Bianchi identity of EGR. The Einstein field equation is based directly on this identity, by making it proportional through the Einstein constant k to the Noether Theorem. UFT88 shows using tensor analysis that the second Bianchi identity is incorrect due to its neglect of torsion, and so the Einstein field equation is incorrect. The true identity was given by Cartan but a few years after the publication of the Einstein field equation. Einstein never found the correct unified field theory. The omission of torsion is a fatal error, one of many in EGR. My doubts crystallized in UFT122, where the commutator method showed that the torsion is never zero and that the connection is antisymmetric. These fatal flaws in EGR have been discussed in previous essays. Just to be crystal clear the Cartan identity was proven exactly in UFT137.

However the mathematics of these papers are still too difficult for 98% of the profession, so the dogmatists could still wriggle around and obfuscate, bluff and bluster and cyberstalk. Suddenly the EGR theory fell apart completely in UFT193, in which its force law is shown to be incorrect. The same lagrangian method as used in EGR produces a different force law. Conversely, when the incorrect force law of EGR is used with computer algebra to produce an orbit, that orbit is hugely complicated, and nothing like a precessing ellipse. The methods used in UFT193 should be accessible to say half of the profession. After UFT193 there is no going back to EGR and several catastrophic mistakes appeared. These are collected in the forthcoming book: "Definitive Refutations of Einsteinian General Relativity" (Cambridge International Science Publishing, CISP, www.cisp-publishing.com, Spring 2012). I continued to search for the very simplest demonstration of the truth, and this is given in UFT202. The demonstration starts with the observed orbit, a precessing ellipse, and differentiates it to give the orbital equation. The latter is compared with the prediction of EGR and the results are totally different. Einstein could not possibly have produced a correct

theory of perihelion precession, as many now realize. The experimental result is Eq. (31) of UFT202, the EGR result is Eq. (30) of UFT202. The two equations are written one above the other so as to leave no doubt at all in the mind of any rational and intellectually honest individual. This means that all the claims of general relativity made throughout a dark and dogmatic century are pure nonsense. The next essay will deal with the momentous consequences of this simplest and clearest of refutations. It cannot be covered up, it is too simple to obfuscate. If physics is to survive as a subject then a new general relativity entirely is needed.