

SRT is really encrypted (coded) NM

Albert Einstein's theory of Special Relativity (SRT) has been in use for over a century. Some have even considered it "settled science", with Newtonian Mechanics (NM) a tolerable approximation at low speeds. But it still has paradoxes such as the twin paradox and the barn/pole paradox which should not exist. Yet it seems to work. How can this be?

The SRT Relativistic Interval equation, from which *all* the equations and concepts of SRT derive, is

$$I^2 = (ct)^2 - x^2 = (ct')^2 - x'^2 = (ct'')^2 - x''^2 = \dots ,$$

which can also be written as

$$x^2 + I^2 = (ct)^2 \quad ; \quad x'^2 + I^2 = (ct')^2 \quad ; \quad x''^2 + I^2 = (ct'')^2 \quad ; \quad \dots .$$

It turns out, upon careful examination, that SRT is wrong because the " $(ct)^2$ " expression is wrong. The correct phrase is " $(c't)^2$ " as shown in "[The Interval Equation Shows the Error of Special Relativity Theory \(SRT\)](#)" and "[Simple Algebra and Special Relativity](#)".

SRT is definitely 'wrong' but in the sense that "Ifmmp" as a substitute for "Hello" is wrong. "Ifmmp" is an encryption of "Hello" by substituting each letter in "Hello" with the next letter of the alphabet. This could be applied to anything you write.

It turns out that, in the same sense, SRT is really an encryption of plain old Newtonian Mechanics (NM) because, in *every* instance, there is a 1:1 correspondence between the SRT depiction of any events and the NM depiction of the same events! **In other words, SRT is actually NM converted into a code**, just like "Ifmmp" is "Hello" converted into a code. This is completely explained and proven in "[SRT to NM and vice versa](#)".

For example, if an object moves 200 meters while light moves 300 meters (1.0 microsecond), then NM says the object's speed $V = 200 \text{ m}/\mu\text{s}$ ($V = 0.66\dots c$) while SRT says its speed is $v = 166.41 \text{ m}/\mu\text{s}$ ($v = 0.55470c$). Likewise for the object moving 400 meters while the light moves 300 meters (again, 1 μs): $V = 400 \text{ m}/\mu\text{s}$ ($V = 1.33\dots c$) while SRT's $v = 240 \text{ m}/\mu\text{s}$ ($v = 0.8c$). If the object had moved 4,000m vs the light's 300m, the numbers would be $V = 13.33\dots c$ and $v = 0.997199c$.

That 1:1 correspondence between NM and SRT is

$$V = \gamma v \quad ; \quad (V/c) = \gamma(v/c) \quad \text{where}$$

$$\gamma = (1/(1-(v/c)^2))^{1/2} = (V/v) = (ct')/I = (I^2 + x'^2)^{1/2}/I = ((V/c)^2 + 1)^{1/2}$$

as can be easily checked.

So c appears to be a 'limiting speed' because the SRT 'speed' v is not the correct value for speed. Time 'dilation' (and its corollary, length contraction) do not exist. They are simply artifacts caused by SRT's v being treated as a real

velocity rather than as a function, $v=(V/\gamma)=(V/((V/c)^2 + 1)^{1/2})$, of the true speed, V , of NM.

Additionally, “How to derive Newtonian Mechanics Directly from Only the Equations of Special Relativity” does exactly what it says. It derives the NM transformation equation $x'=Vt+x$ using nothing but Einstein’s SRT equations, again proving that NM and SRT are 1:1 transformations of each other.

On another note, even Einstein’s famous equation $E=mc^2$ is incorrect—but incorrect according to SRT! He really believed that if E increased, then mass m increased. Since everything has multiple velocities, depending on what you are comparing it to, everything would have multiple masses if $E=mc^2$ were correct. According to SRT, it should read $E=\gamma mc^2$. Mass does not change with velocity, γ does, as shown by deriving the correct formula from the SRT Interval equation in “SRT reveals $E=mc^2$ is flawed”.

Mass and energy can presumably interconvert but, as noted above, mass does not change with velocity *per se*. Thus, rest mass ‘energy’, mc^2 , simply becomes an unnecessary ‘constant’ that is bandied about. This is fully covered in the short article “On the Strange Concept of Rest Mass Energy”.

SRT uses its distorted (false) velocity v in the integral which gives rise to the SRT kinetic energy formula $(\gamma-1)mc^2$. (Had they used P/m , momentum per unit mass instead, they might have gotten it right.) However, this results in energy characteristically not being conserved in elastic collisions *vs.* in the NM depiction where it is. The article “Kinetic Energy is Characteristically Not Conserved in Special Relativity (SRT) Collisions” covers this subject.

When done correctly, the SRT formula becomes $\frac{1}{2}m(\gamma v)^2$ which is the same as the NM version as revealed in the article “Relativistic vs. Newtonian Kinetic Energy”.

The error Einstein introduced to create SRT is the result of applying his Second Postulate to the correct Interval equation,

$$I^2 = (ct)^2 - x^2 = (c't)^2 - x'^2 = (c''t)^2 - x''^2 = \dots$$

(discussed in “The Interval Equation Shows the Error of Special Relativity Theory (SRT)” mentioned above) although that is not how Einstein arrived at his conclusions.

Paraphrasing from his 1905 paper, “light always travels at speed c in free space” [a vacuum]. This is a meaningless statement because you must ask, speed c relative to what? “Everything” is not a suitable answer, as shown next.

A second way the Second Postulate is often expressed is that “light travels at speed c in all reference frames.” This is as obviously erroneous as saying that Leo (light) is moving away from George, Thomas, Paul, and Roger at the same

speed as he is from James when the latter five are all moving in different directions and speeds with respect to each other.

In summary, SRT uses an untenable Second Postulate to incorrectly modify the value of one variable, velocity, v , and create another, 'dilated' time, t' , to compensate for it, resulting in creating what amounts to an encryption of Newtonian Mechanics. Because it's an encryption, a SRT version of events may be converted back into the correct NM rendition and *vice versa* as mentioned above.

What about the experimental 'proofs' of SRT? Dr. Howard Hayden in 1992 revealed that, while all the 'proofs' were compatible with SRT, they were not *exclusive* to SRT and could just as easily be interpreted differently. To quote: "It is the case, however, that all experiments claiming support for Einstein theory - without a single exception known to the writer - come from E n G [referring to a Venn diagram]; that is, they lend support to Galilean relativity and Einstein theory with equanimity." The reference is

Hayden, H., "Distinctions Between Galilean and Einsteinian Physics," Galilean Electrodynamics, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 23-27, March/April 1992.

All SRT depictions should be converted to their sensible NM form and SRT should be removed completely from General Relativity and everything else.