

## **Relativity does not require Spacetime curvature**

Roger J Anderton

[R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com](mailto:R.J.Anderton@btinternet.com)

There was a great deal of criticism against Einstein's relativity in its early days. Dingle eventually became a part of that criticism. Initially he was a supporter of Einstein's relativity and eventually decided it was wrong. But Dingle was still a relativist. (Although some try to rewrite history that he was a relationist not relativist.) [1] Really Dingle had not learnt his relativity from Einstein. Dingle had learnt his relativity from a non-Einstein tradition of relativity; namely via Whitehead. That there was a second tradition of relativity besides Einstein was dealt with in my previous article. [2]

There was an alternative relativity to Einstein's involving many people, and in that relativity – spacetime curvature was not required.

The relativity issue at present gets bogged down with people who cannot understand the basic idea of relativity that objects move relative to each other, when really the issue is that Einstein did not have a proper understanding of relativity. With them diverting the discussion onto their mental blindspot with relativity, we are diverted from the real issue. They are in a sense the reason why Einstein's mistakes are still upheld, because they block proper discussion.

So let's now pick up the real issue-

Ronny Desmet [3] informs us: ".....Whitehead and Einstein discussed relativity is what Phillip Frank writes in his Einstein biography. According to Frank: "Whitehead had long discussions with Einstein and repeatedly attempted to convince him that on metaphysical grounds the attempt must be made to get along without the assumption of a curvature of space. Einstein, however, was not inclined to give up a theory, against which neither logical nor experimental reasons could be cited, nor considerations of simplicity and beauty. Whitehead's metaphysics did not seem quite plausible to him." Frank's account seems much more plausible to me than Bonner's. It is indeed very likely that Whitehead tried to convince Einstein to give up his identification of the geometry of space-time and the physics of gravitation, which implied a non-uniform curvature of space-time by the inhomogeneous spread of matter, hence contradicting Whitehead's metaphysical view of the spatio-temporal uniformity of the network of all events."

"An interesting aspect of Frank's account is the fact that he does not write "a long discussion," but "long discussions," and that he claims that Whitehead

repeatedly attempted to convince Einstein. This aspect of Frank's account can also be confirmed. Indeed, in the overview to her mother of what happened during Einstein's stay on June 11th, the day after the dinner-party, Elizabeth Haldane writes "Whitehead, the mathematician, had a long and useful talk," and she adds that "afterwards [...] the Einsteins rested." Moreover, the fact that Whitehead and Einstein also had a long discussion on Saturday July 11th, is confirmed by a special correspondent of The Times – most likely J. W. N. Sullivan – and by a Spanish journalist of El Sol, Ricardo Baeza, who was based in London and Dublin in 1920- 1921. The strikingly similar accounts of the joint interview the Times correspondent and Baeza had with Einstein – assisted by Freundlich – on July 11th, appeared in The Times of June 13th, 1921, and in El Sol on July 4th, 1921."

"A servant ushered the two journalists into Lord Haldane's library, and they were told that Einstein had just risen from bed, having been tired out by a long scientific discussion just before their visit (which, by the way, corresponds nicely with what Elizabeth writes on Einstein resting after his talk with Whitehead). During the interview, at a certain point, the Times journalist mentioned Whitehead and his alternative theory of relativity. Here is what he writes on what happened then: "Both Einstein and his disciple [Freundlich] became more animated at this point, and informed me that they had just spent two hours in discussing his theory with Professor Whitehead and that they did not yet fully understand it. I remembered the "long scientific discussion" which, I had been told, had sent Einstein to bed, and I did not press the matter.""

Now let's link that to Silberstein.

Desmet: "Silberstein, trained as a physicist in Poland, student of (among others) Hermann von Helmholtz and Max Plank in Germany, lecturer in mathematical physics in Italy, and author of a 1911 quaternion-formulation of STR, moved to England in 1912, where he obtained a lectureship at University College, London.

"Consequently, Whitehead and Silberstein were University College colleagues during the academic year 1912-1913. After joining the Aristotelian Society in 1915, Whitehead became close friends with Thomas Percy Nunn, who was close with Silberstein. Finally, on November 6, 1919, Whitehead was present when Silberstein questioned Arthur Eddington at the famous joint meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society announcing the results of the May 1919 solar eclipse expedition testing Einstein's GTR.[me: GTR means General theory of Relativity]"

me: i.e there was a lot of them involved with Relativity.

Silberstein is particularly interesting as he is described by Desmet as:

Desmet: Silberstein, who had a kind of love-hate relationship with Einstein's GTR – willing to accept it wholeheartedly, and yet, relentlessly criticizing it –

has been called Einstein's "advocatus diaboli," as well as "Einstein's antagonist."

And by McCausland we have the meeting to decide whether Einstein was right or wrong in 1919 as being like a Congregation of rites with Silberstein acting as Devil's advocate not being allowed to present his criticism, so that Einstein was canonized unfairly [4]:

McCausland: "The meeting has also been described in a very interesting way by Abraham Pais (1982), who identified the day of the joint meeting as "the day on which Einstein was canonized." Pais was obviously very pleased with his comparison of the meeting to a Congregation of Rites at which a candidate is considered for canonization in the Catholic Church, and compared various participants at the meeting to counterparts in the Congregation of Rites, using as his reference *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*. However, one of his comparisons was highly inappropriate, namely his comparison of Ludwik Silberstein to the *advocatus diaboli*, or Devil's advocate. Although Silberstein was critical of accepting that the results superseded Newton's theory, the circumstances in which his criticisms were expressed were totally different, in at least two important respects, from the circumstances in which the arguments of the Devil's advocate are expressed in a Congregation of Rites."

"In the first place, it is imperative that the arguments of the Devil's advocate be heard *before* canonization is pronounced, and Pais's account gives the impression that Silberstein's criticisms had been heard before the results were endorsed by the President of the Royal Society. However, the generally accepted account of the meeting (Thomson, 1919) shows that Thomson had, to use Pais's words, "pronounced the canonization" before Silberstein had had a chance to speak."

"In the second place, it is the responsibility of the Devil's advocate to ensure that canonization does not occur undeservedly. In order to fulfill that responsibility, he must be given full access to all the relevant information required to make the case for the opposition to canonization. This condition was not fulfilled at the meeting at which the eclipse results were announced, because it was not possible for members of the audience to be sufficiently well-informed about the results that were being announced to make informed criticism of them."

me: i.e the canonization of Einstein was a farce.

As to what Silberstein points out – Newtonian physics gives the same result for lightbending as that claimed; and that being the case there was no need for spacetime curvature. [5]

Let's now look at Dingle. Dingle campaigned against Special relativity after Einstein died.

The way the mainstream tries to rewrite history is to reclassify Dingle as a relationist not a relativist, and to claim that neither he or Whitehead understood relativity:

Kevin Brown: “To understand the origin of Dingle’s campaign against special relativity during his retirement years, it’s necessary to examine his earlier writings, which make it quite clear that he had always fundamentally misunderstood relativity. For one thing, he believed special relativity was a *relational* theory of motion. This is perhaps less surprising when we learn that he was introduced to the “theory of relativity” by A. N. Whitehead (1861-1947), which illustrates the disadvantages of being taught a subject by someone who doesn’t understand it himself. Whitehead, a mathematician and philosopher, was an early critic of general relativity.” [4]

Its all just another layer of obfuscation because the canonization of Einstein was a farce. The canonization happened too quickly. The Devil’s advocate case was not allowed to be given proper hearing, which clearly indicated no canonization was required. Now we have Einstein as falsely canonized, when Whitehead met with Einstein to discuss relativity; of course Einstein would not want to relinquish his canonization. Dingle naively thought all he had to do was to point out the absurdities of Special relativity and the canonization would be reversed. But the Establishment had been too entrenched in upholding Einstein’s mistakes and too afraid to admit its canonization was a mistake. The Science Establishment finds its easier to enforce the “sheep” to conform to the mess, and why it made the mess in the first place we find it was all for political reasons nothing to do with science; i.e corruption of science for political agendas. It’s what I observe in human behaviour in organizations, namely- create a mess and carry on regardless because that is the way being enforced to do things.

## References

[1] What Happened to Dingle? Kevin Brown

<http://www.mathpages.com/home/kmath024/kmath024.htm>

[2] The Second version of Relativity Theory, Roger J Anderton

[3] Whitehead and the British Reception of Einstein’s Relativity: An Addendum to Victor Lowe’s Whitehead Biography, Ronny Desmet, October 2, 2007 [http://www.ctr4process.org/publications/SeminarPapers/30\\_2-DesmetR.pdf](http://www.ctr4process.org/publications/SeminarPapers/30_2-DesmetR.pdf)

[4] Anomalies in the History of Relativity, IAN MCCAUSLAND  
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering,  
University of Toronto, Journal of Scientific Exploration, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp.  
271–290, 1999

[http://www.imamu.edu.sa/Scientific\\_selections/abstracts/Physics/Anomalies%20in%20the%20History%20of%20Relativity.pdf](http://www.imamu.edu.sa/Scientific_selections/abstracts/Physics/Anomalies%20in%20the%20History%20of%20Relativity.pdf)

[5] The True Relation of Einstein's to Newton's Equations of Motion. LUDWIK SILBERSTEIN. *NATURE* DECEMBER I, 1923 p 788 -789 <http://www.wbabin.net/historical/silberstein3.pdf>  
c.RJAnderton2010-07-18