----- Original Message -----
From: Stephen Crothers
To: EMyrone@aol.com
Cc: fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com ; garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk ; ted@annis.org ; fdamador@comcast.net ; annwvyn76@hotmail.com ; sean@somewhere.ws ; dave@annexa.net ; HorstEck@aol.com ; rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk ; patternsof-thought@yahoo.com ; twidlar@yahoo.com ; spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com ; kp.phys@btinternet.com ; karel.jelinek@gmail.com ; thenarmis@yahoo.com ; felker.larry@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2008 8:37 AM
Subject: Re: [AIAS] Fwd: Fwd: Gravitational Radiation

Gentlemen,
Concerning gravitational waves I offer the following remarks.

Einstein's pseudo-tensor has no mathematical existence and so it cannot be rightly used to describe anything. Einstein introduced his pseudo-tensor, ad hoc, to satisfy the requirement of a vanishing divergence (conservation of energy). His theory did not produce the required divergence, so he simply introduced his pseudo-tensor to get it. However, he failed to realise that his definition of the pseudo-tensor, despite giving him what he wanted for his theory, is utter nonsense because it is mathematically meaningless. Einstein invented his pseudo-tensor so that his preconceptions of the localisation and conservation of gravitational energy could be achieved. In other words, he made it up, to secure his preconceived notions from his theory. That is always dangerous, and in his case quite fatal. That fatality is the consequence is not surprising, given that Einstein's pseudo-tensor is not a tensor, and only (apparently) describes the localisation of gravitational energy in a preferred direction, and only propagates energy at the speed of light in vacuo in a preferred set of coordinates purposely chosen to make it so. As A. Eddington remarked in his book 'The mathematical theory of relativity', this line of reasoning is a vicious circle. I quote Eddington (from section 57 of his book):

"The statement that in the relativity theory gravitational waves are propagated with the speed of light has, I believe, been based entirely on the foregoing investigation; but it will be seen that it is only true in a very conventional sense. If coordinates are chosen so as to satisfy a certain condition which has no very clear geometrical importance, the speed is that of light; if the coordinates are slightly different the speed is altogether different from that of light. The result stands or falls by the choice of coordinates and, so far as can be judged, the coordinates here used were purposely introduced in order to obtain the simplification which results from representing the propagation as occurring with the speed of light. The argument thus follows a vicious circle."

P. A. M. Dirac (see section 31 of his book, General Relativity) also remarks:

"It is not possible to obtain an expression for the energy of the gravitational field satisfying both the conditions: (i) when added to other forms of energy the total energy is conserved,

and (ii) the energy within a definite (three-dimensional) region at a certain time is independent of the coordinate system. Thus, in general, gravitational energy cannot be localised. The best we can do is to use the pseudo-tensor, which satisfies condition (i) but not condition (ii). It gives us approximate information about the gravitational energy, which in some special cases can be accurate."

But with Levi-Civita's proof of the mathematical invalidity of Einstein's pseudo-tensor, Dirac's arguments also completely collapse. T. Levi-Civita proved in 1917 that Einstein's pseudo-tensor implies the existence of a 1st-order intrinsic differential invariant i.e. the said invariant depends only upon the components of the metric tensor and their 1st derivatives. However, Ricci and Levi-Civita proved in 1900 that such invariants do not exist! It must also be remembered that Weyl proved in 1944 that linearisation of Einstein's field equations is impossible, because linearisation implies the existence of a tensor, except for the case of being precisely zero, does not otherwise exist! I posted his paper to my website some time ago, along with that of Levi-Civita.

I have recently argued that Ric = 0 violates Einstein's 'Principle of Equivalence' and so it cannot describe his gravitational field. The consequence of this is unavoidable - the formulation of Einstein's field equations as suggested by H. A. Lorentz and independently by T. Levi-Civita must hold. Thus, within the framework of Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, the total energy of the gravitational field is always zero; Einstein's tensor and the energy-momentum tensor must vanish identically; gravitational energy cannot be localised (i.e. no gravitational waves).

Yours faithfully,
Steve Crothers.

On Thu, Feb 28, 2008 at 5:27 PM, <EMyrone@aol.com> wrote:
Agreed!

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Gareth Evans <garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk>
To: <emyrone@aol.com>
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 22:30:01 +0000
Subject: RE: [AIAS] Fwd: Fwd: Gravitational Radiation
.....and if gravitational waves do exist, ECE theory should tell us why they have been so difficult to detect. Also, as for space-energy, numerical work may then direct us towards the optimum conditions necessary for observing the waves - perhaps even in the lab (as Horst suggests).

Best, Gareth

From: EMyrone@aol.com
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 15:16:21 -0500
To: aias@somewhere.ws
Subject: [AIAS] Fwd: Fwd: Gravitational Radiation

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
From: EMyrone@aol.com
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 15:15:55 -0500
Subject: Fwd: [AIAS] Fwd: Gravitational Radiation
To: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk; annwvyn76@hotmail.com; BBCMidWales@bbc.co.uk; ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk; ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk; john.hague@swansea.gov.uk; fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com;ted@annis.org; fdamador@comcast.net; sean@somewhere.ws; dave@annexa.net; HorstEck@aol.com; rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk; patternsof-thought@yahoo.com; twidlar@yahoo.com; spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com;kp.phys@btinternet.com; karel.jelinek@gmail.com; thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com

Wholly agreed! "I will have a little think". I like this friendly atmosphere inside the MEI - we decided to change it form MEU to avoid any problems of degree accreditation. We have tems of thousands of students of ECE already, of all ages and backgrounds.

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
From: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk
To: emyrone@aol.com; aias@somewhere.ws
Subject: RE: [AIAS] Fwd: Gravitational Radiation
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 20:12:18 +0000

What an achievement this would be if it could be demonstrated in the lab - and substantiated numerically!! The waste of resources by the standard model elite would again be exposed!!

Best, Gareth

From: EMyrone@aol.com
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 11:58:09 -0500
To: aias@somewhere.ws
Subject: [AIAS] Fwd: Gravitational Radiation

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
From: EMyrone@aol.com
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 11:57:42 -0500
Subject: Fwd: Gravitational Radiation
To: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk; annwvyn76@hotmail.com; BBCMidWales@bbc.co.uk; ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk; ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk;john.hague@swansea.gov.uk; fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com; ted@annis.org; fdamador@comcast.net; sean@somewhere.ws; dave@annexa.net; HorstEck@aol.com; rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk;patternsof-thought@yahoo.com;

twidlar@yahoo.com; spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com; kp.phys@btinternet.com; karel.jelinek@gmail.com; thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com

I think this is plausible if possible without further huge expenditure, and I should also think about applying the gravitational wave equation to the binary pulsar. It would be optimal if a simple experiment could prove this principle using available data.

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
To: EMyrone@aol.com
Subject: Re: Gravitational Radiation
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 11:25:16 -0500
From: horsteck@aol.com

According to the "unification principle" of ECE (all gravitational effects have e-m equivalents and vice versa) both types of waves should be the same. It depends on the medium if they are experienced as e-m ratiation (factor A(0) must be present). So I suppose that the LIGO space detector will be able to detect a plain wave type of gravitational waves which are consistent with the ECE wave equation. With detectors with high enough sensititivity and a suitable experimental setup it should be possible to prove the "unification principle" for waves experimentally in the lab.

Horst

-----Original Message-----
From: EMyrone@aol.com
To: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk; annwvyn76@hotmail.com; BBCMidWales@bbc.co.uk; ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk; ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk;john.hague@swansea.gov.uk; fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com; ted@annis.org; fdamador@comcast.net; sean@somewhere.ws; dave@annexa.net; HorstEck@aol.com;rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk; patternsof-thought@yahoo.com; twidlar@yahoo.com; spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com; kp.phys@btinternet.com; karel.jelinek@gmail.com;thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com
Sent: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 2:24 pm
Subject: Fwd: Gravitational Radiation

Fully agreed! We always value your comments at AIAS and worldwide, and the Bianchi identity is absolutely central to Cartan geometry. I have been exceedingly careful to prove that if D ^ T : = R ^ q then D ^ T tilde := R tilde ^ q, the most rigorous proof being paper 104. The EH geometry is T = 0, R ^ q = 0. We proved by computer algebra that R tilde ^ q is NOT zero for a Christoffel connection but T tilde is zero, so the Christoffel connection is incompatible with the Bianchi identity. This is a disaster for EH theory and everything that comes from it, but instead of just taking the old traditional skullsplitter attitude of my Norse Viking ancestor "Uncle Olaf wants you", I decided to construct a new theory of the precision tests of general relativity. This is already causing the usual very positive interest worldwide. The correct scientific attitude is "OK so it's wrong, let's do something new", but the theology has set in concrete. Even given EH, Steve Crothers has shown with great rigour that its known solutions are incompatible with black holes. So to talk of colliding black holes is pure LSD. On the other hand the ECE gravitational wave equation predicts gravitational waves from the tetrad postulate, so I am open minded, they may or may not exist, but the huge expenditure is in any case indefensible - very soon no petrol. That's just my two cents anyway.

Attached Message
From:

Gareth Evans <garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk>
To:
emyrone@aol.com; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk; annwvyn76@hotmail.com;
bbcmidwales@bbc.co.uk; ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk;
ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk;john.hague@swansea.gov.uk; fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com;
ted@annis.org; fdamador@comcast.net; sean@somewhere.ws; dave@annexa.net;
horsteck@aol.com;rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk; patternsof-thought@yahoo.com;
twidlar@yahoo.com; spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com; kp.phys@btinternet.com;
karel.jelinek@gmail.com;thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com
Subject:
RE: Gravitational Radiation
Date:
Wed, 27 Feb 2008 13:08:42 +0000

As you say, they have not been detected yet Myron and if they do exist there is another interpretation available now based on ECE. As you also say, if they are not detected there has been a vast waste of resources. But I suspect, however, that they will then move on and build even bigger detectors with "better resolution" and waste another pile of money!!

Best, Gareth

From: EMyrone@aol.com
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 07:58:22 -0500
Subject: Fwd: Gravitational Radiation
To: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk;
annwvyn76@hotmail.com; BBCMidWales@bbc.co.uk;
ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk;ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk; john.hague@swansea.gov.uk;
fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com; ted@annis.org; fdamador@comcast.net;
sean@somewhere.ws;dave@annexa.net; HorstEck@aol.com; rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk;
patternsof-thought@yahoo.com; twidlar@yahoo.com;
spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com;kp.phys@btinternet.com; karel.jelinek@gmail.com;
thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com

Many thanks! Unfortunately these detectors aim to detect something that is based on a Christoffel connection, incompatible with the Bianchi identity (papers 93 to 106). In ECE theory gravitational waves are described by

(d'alembertian + kT) q sup a sub mu = 0

and if they exist these detectors will prove ECE in this way, but not EH. The claim for gravitational radiation comes from a binary pulsar found in 1974 by Russell Hulse and Joseph Taylor at Princeton. By coinicdence I have just been reading up on this and the pulsar has a period of 59 milliseconds. It consists of a pulsar and a companion star, each of mass 1.4 million times that of the sun. The orbit is gradually shrinking by about 3.1 mm per orbit. This is the only actual evidence for gravitational waves as Steve Crothers will probably confirm. He was involved in opposing this huge waste of money in Australia - money spent on these detectors. The starnge thing is that the standard model people claim that the orbital precession in this pulsar of 4.2 degrees a year is given exactly by EH. If this is so, how can the orbit be shrinking? This is a self contradiction because if teh orbit is shrinking, the precession cannot be a consatnt 4.2 degrees a year adn so EH cannot precisely predict it. Thsi prediction is based on the potential given in paper 105 and notes for paper 106. The potential consists of a centripetal repulsion, a Newtonian ttraction, and a GR correction. In ECE this correction is proportional to - T / R, which if time dependent leads to an orbital collapse as observed. The Einstein Hilbert equation upon which all of this is based is itself based on a torsionless geometry, and as shown in paper 93 to 106 this is incompatible with the Bianchi identity. So as Steve and I have shown indepndently, the claims of gravitational radiation based on EH cannot be compatible with the Bianchi identity of Cartan. We have shown thsi using computer algebra in paper 93 onwards. Colliding black holes are a nonsense, as Steve has shown, so much of this public consumption website material is theological in nature.

What IS possible however, if anyone ever detects gravitational waves, is that they are generated by the ECE wave equation above. The latter is derived from the tetrad postulate as you know. In ECE theory they must propagate at the speed of light c.

--Forwarded Message Attachment--
From: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk
To: emyrone@aol.com; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk; annwvyn76@hotmail.com; bbcmidwales@bbc.co.uk; ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk;ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk; john.hague@swansea.gov.uk; fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com; ted@annis.org; fdamador@comcast.net; sean@somewhere.ws;dave@annexa.net; horsteck@aol.com; rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk; patternsof-thought@yahoo.c om; twidlar@yahoo.com;spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com; kp.phys@btinternet.com; karel.jelinek@gmail.com; thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com
Subject: RE: Gravitational Radiation
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 12:25:32 +0000

For info Myron, several countries are constructing *gravity wave detectors*. Once the projects are in operation, it is expected that the detectors will work collaboratively. In the United States, the detector project is called LIGO (for Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory). LIGO researchers hope to establish the existence of gravitational waves and prove whether or not they actually propagate at the speed of light and cause the displacement of matter that they pass through. The LIGO system consists of suspended weights with mirrored surfaces that can move freely horizontally. If a gravitational wave were to pass through, the distance between the weights (which is measured by a laser beam moving back and forth between the mirrors and then recombined at a photodetector) would be altered.
Researchers from the California Institute of Technology (Caltech) and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) have developed a LIGO prototype sensitive enough to detect a tiny movement (many times smaller than the diameter of a single hair) in a test weight 40 meters away. Worldwide, the other gravitational wave detection projects include a collaborative effort by France and Italy called *VIRGO*, another by Germany and Great Britain called *GEO 600*, a project in Japan called *TAMA 300*, one in Australia called *ACIGA*, and NASA's LISA project. In early 2005, the LIGO project announced a plan to use a million volunteered personal computers to search for a gravity wave source. PC users can download the software from LIGO; the project is called Einstein@home.

Best, Gareth

From: EMyrone@aol.com
Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 06:25:15 -0500
Subject: Gravitational Radiation
To: garethjohnevans@hotmail.co.uk; rhodri.morgan@wales.gov.uk; annwvyn76@hotmail.com; BBCMidWales@bbc.co.uk;ioan.richards@swansea.gov.uk; ewehoe@yahoo.co.uk; john.hague@swansea.gov.uk; fucilla@electrosilicagroup.com; ted@annis.org;fdamador@comcast.net; sean@somewhere.ws; dave@annexa.net; HorstEck@aol.com; rob@rfmicrosystems.co.uk; patternsof-thought@yahoo.com;

twidlar@yahoo.com; spherical_symmetry@yahoo.com; kp.phys@btinternet.com; karel.jelinek@gmail.com;thenarmis@yahoo.com; felker.larry@gmail.com

In quite an old site www.davis-inc.com/relativity/ the basic assumptions of gravitational radiation are described and it is stated that no one has succeeded in recording gravitational waves in a terrestrial or extra terrestrial receiver. It is just assumed that the Hulse Taylor pulsar shows that the radiation exists. On this site there is a paper in which the equations of gravitational radiation are derived to quadrupole order in the Brans Dicke and Rosen theories. The actual data show that there is a systematic decrease in the orbital period. It is claimed that this decrease is consistent with energy loss due to gravitational radiation. One of the methods used is the Einstein Infeld Hoffmann method, which solves the equation of motion as a power series in v / c. Gravitational radiation is estimated using the motion so derived to deduce the rate of change of total energy and to ASSUME that the decrease is due to gravitational radiation. It is also assumed that the decrease in orbital period cannot be accounted for by other means. Therefore to look at this problem objectively, ECE theory must be applied to calculate a rate of change of total energy. This can come about by assuming that T / R is time dependent in the potential energy expressions in papers 105 and notes for paper 106. This is a far simpler and more plausible assumption than gravitational radiation, whose theory is based on the Christoffel connection and is therefore incompatible with the Bianchi identity as argued in papers 93 to 106. I assume that the situation has not changed since the mid seventies, when the Hulse Taylor binary pulsar was first observed, and that gravitational radiation has still not been detected by a receiver. The expense must now run into the billions. So this is an expensive pastime of the standard model.