Fundamental Errors in the General Theory of Relativity

Stephen J. Crothers

3.1 Introduction

The notion of black holes voraciously gobbling up matter, twisting spacetime into contortions that trap light, stretching the unwary into long spaghetti-like strands as they fall inward to ultimately collide and merge with an infinitely dense point-mass singularity, has become a mantra of the astrophysical community. There are almost daily reports of scientists claiming that they have again found black holes again here and there. It is asserted that black holes range in size from micro to mini, to intermediate and on up through to supermassive behemoths and it is accepted as scientific fact that they have been detected at the centres of galaxies. Images of black holes interacting with surrounding matter are routinely included with reports of them. Some physicists even claim that black holes will be created in particle accelerators, such as the Large Hadron Collider, potentially able to swallow the Earth, if care is not taken in their production. Yet contrary to the assertions of the astronomers and astrophysicists of the black hole community, nobody has ever found a black hole, anywhere, let alone imaged one. The pictures adduced to convince are actually either artistic impressions (i.e. drawings) or photos of otherwise unidentified objects imaged by telescopes and merely asserted to be due to black holes, *ad hoc*.

It is similarly claimed that General Relativity predicts expansion of the Universe with a big bang cosmology and that the Cosmic Microwave Background is not only cosmic but is also the remnant of the big bang.

Nonetheless it is not difficult to demonstrate that claims of black holes, expansion of the Universe and big bang cosmology have no sound basis in science.

3.2 General principles

The alleged signatures of the black hole are an infinitely dense point-mass singularity and an event horizon. Scientists frequently assert that the escape velocity of a black hole is that of light in vacuum and that nothing, not even light, can escape from the black hole. In fact, according to the same scientists, nothing, including light, can even leave the black hole. But there is already a serious problem with these bald claims (black holes are also alleged to have "no hair"). If the escape velocity of a black hole is that of light, then light, on the one hand, can escape. On the other hand, light is allegedly not able to even leave the black hole; so the black hole has no escape velocity. If the escape velocity of a black hole is that of light in vacuum, not only can light both leave and escape, material objects can also leave the event horizon, but not escape, even though, according to the Theory of Special Relativity, they can only have a velocity less than that of light in vacuum. This just means that if the black hole has an escape velocity then material bodies can in fact leave the black hole and eventually stop and fall back to the black hole, just like a ball thrown into the air here on Earth with an initial velocity less than the escape velocity for the

Earth. So the properties of the alleged black hole event horizon are irretrievably contradictory.

The infinitely dense point-mass singularity at the heart of the black hole is supposed to be formed by irresistible gravitational collapse so that matter is crushed into zero volume, into a 'point', a so-called 'point-mass'. One recalls from high school that density is defined as the mass of an object divided by the volume of the object. If the mass is not zero and the volume is zero, as in the case of a black hole singularity, one gets division by zero. But all school children know that division by zero is not allowed by the rules of mathematics. Nonetheless, black hole proponents divide by zero! Furthermore, black holes are allegedly obtained from Einstein's General Theory of Relativity. It is called the General Theory because it is a generalisation of his Special Theory of Relativity. As such, General Relativity cannot, by definition, violate Special Relativity, but that is precisely what the black hole does. Special Relativity forbids infinite densities because, according to that Theory, infinite density implies infinite energy (or equivalently that a material object can acquire the speed of light in vacuo), which contradicts the fundamental postulate of Special Relativity. Therefore General Relativity also forbids infinite densities. But the point-mass singularity of the black hole is allegedly infinitely dense, in violation of Special Relativity. Thus the Theory of Relativity actually forbids the existence of a black hole.

According to the proponents of the black hole it takes an infinite amount of time for an observer to watch an object (via the light from that object, of course) to fall down to the event horizon. So it therefore takes an infinite amount of time for the observer to verify the existence of an event horizon and thereby confirm the presence of a black hole. However, nobody has been and nobody will be around for an infinite amount of time in order to verify the presence of an event horizon and hence the presence of a black hole. Nevertheless, scientists claim that black holes have been found all over the place. The fact is nobody has assuredly found a black hole anywhere - no infinitely dense point-mass singularity and no event horizon. Some black hole proponents are more circumspect in how they claim the discovery of their black holes. They instead say that their evidence for the presence of a black hole is indirect. But such indirect "evidence" cannot be used to justify the claim of a black hole, in view of the fatal contradictions and physically meaningless properties associated with infinitely dense point-mass singularities and event horizons. It is also of great importance to be mindful of the fact that no observations gave rise to the notion of a black hole in the first place, for which a theory had to be developed. The black hole was wholly spawned in the reverse, i.e. it was created by theory and observations subsequently misconstrued to legitimize the theory. Reports of black holes are just wishful thinking in support of a belief; not factual in any way.

Another fatal contradiction in the idea of the black hole is the allegation that black holes can be components of binary systems, collide or merge, be present at the centres of galaxies, and interact with other matter. Let us, for the sake of argument, assume that black holes are predicted by General Relativity. The simplest black hole is fundamentally described by a certain mathematical expression called a line-element (which is just a fancy name for a distance formula, like that learnt in high school) that involves just one alleged mass in the entire Universe (just the alleged source of a gravitational field), since the said distance formula is a solution for a spacetime allegedly described by Einstein's static equations in vacuum (or, more accurately, in emptiness), namely $Ric = 0$. One does not need to know anything at all about the mathematical intricacies of this equation to see that it cannot permit the presence of one black hole, let alone two or more black holes. The mathematical object denoted by Ric is what is called a tensor (in this case it's Ricci's tensor, and hence its notation). The reason why $Ric = 0$ is because in Einstein's General Theory of Relativity all matter that contributes to the source of the gravitational field must be described by another tensor, called the energy-momentum tensor. In the case of the so-called static vacuum field equations the energy-momentum tensor is set to zero, because there is no mass or radiation present by hypothesis. Otherwise Ric would not be equal to zero. So the associated black hole can interact with nothing, not even an 'observer'. $Ric = 0$ does not describe a two body problem, only, allegedly, a one body problem (and hence quite meaningless). One cannot just introduce extra objects into the spacetime of a given solution to Einstein's field equations because his theory requires that the curvature of spacetime (i.e. the gravitational field) is due to the presence of matter and that the said matter, all of it, must be described by his energy-momentum tensor. If the energy-momentum tensor is zero there is no matter present. Furthermore, Einstein's field equations are non-linear, so the 'Principle of Superposition' does not apply. In other words, one cannot obtain a solution to Einstein's field equations for some specified configuration of matter and thereafter just insert additional lumps of matter into the spacetime for that solution. All configurations of matter each require an associated particular energy-momentum tensor and a solution to the field equations for each configuration. Before one can talk of relativistic binary systems and other black hole interactions it must first be proved that the two-body system is theoretically well-defined by General Relativity. This can be done in only two ways:

(a) Derivation of an exact solution to Einstein's field equations for the two-body configuration of matter; or

(b) Proof of an existence theorem.

There are no known solutions to Einstein's field equations for the interaction of two (or more) masses, so option (a) has never been fulfilled. No existence theorem has ever been proven, by which Einstein's field equations even admit of latent solutions for such configurations of matter, and so option (b) has never been fulfilled either. Since $Ric = 0$ is a statement that there is no matter in the Universe, one cannot simply insert a second black hole into the spacetime of $Ric = 0$ of a given black hole so that the resulting two black holes (each obtained separately from $Ric = 0$) mutually interact in a mutual spacetime that by definition contains no matter! One cannot just assert by an analogy with Newton's theory that two black holes can be components of binary systems, collide or merge, or that a black hole can interact with other matter in general, because the 'Principle of Superposition' does not apply in Einstein's theory. Moreover, General Relativity has to date been unable to account for the simple experimental fact that two fixed bodies will approach one another upon release. So from where does the matter allegedly associated with the solution to $Ric = 0$ come, when this is a statement that there is no matter present? The proponents of the black hole just put it in at the end of their calculations, *a posteriori* and *ad hoc*, in violation of their starting hypothesis that $Ric = 0$, and to top it off, they do so by introducing a Newtonian relation. Thus, the concepts of black holes, black hole binaries, collisions and mergers, black holes at the centres of galaxies, and black hole interactions with other matter, are all invalid.

Curiously it is frequently claimed that Newton's theory of gravitation also predicts a black hole. What is actually alluded to is the theoretical Michell-Laplace Dark Body, which has an escape velocity equal to or greater than the velocity of light in vacuo, but which is nonetheless not a black hole. The basis for the spurious claim resides in the fact that the critical radius for the Michell-Laplace Dark Body is given by the same mathematical expression as that for the so-called "Schwarzschild radius" of a black hole. But this is not surprising, because this "radius" was effectively inserted into the distance formula for $Ric = 0$ (called the "Schwarzschild solution"), along with matter, *a posteriori* and *ad hoc*. However, in the space of Newton's gravitation, the radius of the Michell-Laplace Dark Body is the radial distance from the centre of mass of the object, but in the space of the "Schwarzschild solution" the "Schwarzschild radius" it is not even a radial distance in the spatial section of the Schwarzschild spacetime, by reason of the non-Euclidean geometry of Einstein's gravitational field. Furthermore, the black hole is allegedly produced by irresistible gravitational collapse, but the Michell-Laplace Dark Body does not involve irresistible gravitational collapse; the black hole irresistibly collapses into an infinitely dense point-mass singularity but the Michell-Laplace Dark Body does not (its density is finite); no light and no material body can even leave the black hole let alone escape, but light and material bodies can leave the Michell-Laplace Dark body, and at its critical radius light can escape from it; the black hole has an event horizon but the Michell-Laplace Dark Body has no event horizon; the black hole has no escape velocity whereas the Michell-Laplace Dark Body has an escape velocity; no observer, no matter how close to the event horizon, can see a black hole, but there is always a class of observers that can see the Michell-Laplace Dark Body (an observer only needs to be close enough to it); there is no upper limit to the speed of an object in Newton's theory, but no material body can acquire the speed of light in vacuo in Einstein's theory; in the case of a black hole for $Ric = 0$, such as the "Schwarzschild" black hole, an observer can't be present in its spacetime because it is by definition empty, but an observer can always be present in the space of the Michell-Laplace Dark Body because its space is not empty by definition; the 'Principal of Superposition' applies in Newton's theory of gravitation and so in the case of the Michell-Laplace Dark Body, but does not apply in any case of a black hole; and the centre of mass of a body is not a physical object in neither Newton's theory nor Einstein's theory. So the Michell-Laplace Dark Body does not possess the tell-tale signatures of the alleged black hole, and so it is not a black hole. Thus, Newton's theory also does not predict black holes.

Finally, although the fundamental solution to $Ric = 0$ is usually called the "Schwarzschild solution", despite its name, it is not in fact Schwarzschild's solution. Schwarzschild's actual solution forbids black holes. The frequent claim that Schwarzschild found and advocated a black hole solution is patently false, as a reading of Schwarzschild's papers on the subject irrefutably testify. False too are the claims that he obtained an event horizon and that he determined the "Schwarzschild radius" (i.e. the alleged "radius" of the black hole event horizon). Schwarzschild actually had nothing to do with the black hole, but attaching his name to it lends the notion an additional facade of scientific legitimacy.

3.3 Mathematical preamble: spherical symmetry of three-dimensional metrics

Following the method suggested by Palatini, and developed by Levi-Civita [1], denote ordinary Euclidean 3-space by $\mathbf{E}^3$. Let $\mathbf{M}^3$ be a 3-dimensional metric manifold. Let there be a one-to-one correspondence between all points of $\mathbf{E}^3$ and $\mathbf{M}^3$. Let the point $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$ and the corresponding point in $\mathbf{M}^3$ be O'. Then a point transformation T of $\mathbf{E}^3$ into itself gives rise to a corresponding point transformation of $\mathbf{M}^3$ into itself.

A rigid motion in a metric manifold is a motion that leaves the metric $d\ell'^2$ unchanged. Thus, a rigid motion changes geodesics into geodesics. The metric manifold $\mathbf{M}^3$ possesses spherical symmetry around any one of its points O' if each of the ∞^3 rigid rotations in $\mathbf{E}^3$ around the corresponding arbitrary point O determines a rigid motion in $\mathbf{M}^3$.

The coefficients of $d\ell'^2$ of $\mathbf{M}^3$ constitute a metric tensor and are naturally assumed to be regular in the region around every point in $\mathbf{M}^3$, except possibly at an arbitrary point, the centre of spherical symmetry $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$. Let a ray i emanate from an arbitrary point $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$. There is then a corresponding geodesic $i' \in \mathbf{M}^3$ issuing from the corresponding point $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$. Let P be any point on i other than O. There corresponds a point P' on $i' \in \mathbf{M}^3$ different to O'. Let g' be a geodesic in $\mathbf{M}^3$ that is tangential to i' at P'.

Taking i as the axis of ∞^1 rotations in $\mathbf{E}^3$, there corresponds ∞^1 rigid motions in $\mathbf{M}^3$ that leaves only all the points on i' unchanged. If g' is distinct from i', then the ∞^1 rigid rotations in $\mathbf{E}^3$ about i would cause g' to occupy an infinity of positions in $\mathbf{M}^3$ wherein g' has for each position the property of being tangential to i' at P' in the same direction, which is impossible. Hence, g' coincides with i'.

Thus, given a spherically symmetric surface Σ in $\mathbf{E}^3$ with centre of symmetry at some arbitrary point $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$, there corresponds a spherically symmetric geodesic surface Σ' in $\mathbf{M}^3$ with centre of symmetry at the corresponding point $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$. Let Q be a point in $\Sigma \in \mathbf{E}^3$ and Q' the corresponding point in $\Sigma' \in \mathbf{M}^3$. Let $d\sigma$ be a generic line element in Σ issuing from Q. The corresponding generic line element $d\sigma' \in \Sigma'$ issues from the point Q'. Let Σ be described in the usual spherical-polar coordinates r, θ, φ. Then

$$d\sigma^2 = r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \tag{3.1}$$

$$r = |\overline{OQ}|.$$

Clearly, if r, θ, φ are known, Q is determined and hence also Q' in Σ'. Therefore, θ and φ can be considered to be curvilinear coordinates for Q' in Σ' and the line element $d\sigma' \in \Sigma'$ will also be represented by a quadratic form similar to (3.1). To determine $d\sigma'$, consider two elementary arcs of equal length, $d\sigma_1$ and $d\sigma_2$ in Σ, drawn from the point Q in different directions. Then the homologous arcs in Σ' will be $d\sigma'_1$ and $d\sigma'_2$, drawn in different directions from the corresponding point Q'. Now $d\sigma_1$ and $d\sigma_2$ can be obtained from one another by a rotation about the axis $\overline{OQ}$ in $\mathbf{E}^3$, and so $d\sigma_1'$ and $d\sigma_2'$ can be obtained from one another by a rigid motion in $\mathbf{M}^3$, and are therefore also of equal length, since the metric is unchanged by such a motion. It therefore follows that the ratio $d\sigma'/d\sigma$ is the same for the two different directions irrespective of $d\theta$ and $d\varphi$, and so the foregoing ratio is a function of position, i.e. of r, θ, φ. But Q is an arbitrary point in Σ, and so $d\sigma'/d\sigma$ must have the same ratio for any corresponding points Q and Q'. Therefore, $d\sigma'/d\sigma$ is a function of r alone, thus

$$\frac{d\sigma'}{d\sigma} = H(r),$$

and so

$$d\sigma'^2 = H^2(r)d\sigma^2 = H^2(r)r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \tag{3.2}$$

where $H(r)$ is *a priori* unknown. For convenience set $R_c = R_c(r) = H(r)r$, so that (3.2) becomes

$$d\sigma'^2 = R_c^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \tag{3.3}$$

where R_c is a quantity associated with $\mathbf{M}^3$. Comparing (3.3) with (3.1) it is apparent that R_c is to be rightly interpreted in terms of the Gaussian curvature K at the point Q', i.e. in terms of the relation $K = 1/R_c^2$ since the Gaussian curvature of (3.1) is $K = 1/r^2$. This is an intrinsic property of all line elements of the form (3.3) [1]. Accordingly, R_c, the inverse square root of the Gaussian curvature, can be regarded as the radius of Gaussian curvature. Therefore, in (3.1) the radius of Gaussian curvature is $R_c = r$. Moreover, owing to spherical symmetry, all points in the corresponding surfaces Σ and Σ' have constant Gaussian curvature relevant to their respective manifolds and centres of symmetry, so that all points in the respective surfaces are umbilics.

Let the element of radial distance from $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$ be dr. Clearly, the radial lines issuing from O cut the surface Σ orthogonally. Combining this with (3.1) by the theorem of Pythagoras gives the line element in $\mathbf{E}^3$

$$d\ell^2 = dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2). \tag{3.4}$$

Let the corresponding radial geodesic from the point $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$ be dR_p. Clearly the radial geodesics issuing from O' cut the geodesic surface Σ' orthogonally. Combining this with (3.3) by the theorem of Pythagoras gives the line element in $\mathbf{M}^3$ as,

$$d\ell'^2 = dR_p^2 + R_c^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \tag{3.5}$$

where dR_p is, by spherical symmetry, also a function only of R_c. Set $dR_p = \sqrt{B(R_c)}dR_c$, so that (3.5) becomes

$$d\ell'^2 = B(R_c)dR_c^2 + R_c^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \tag{3.6}$$

where $B(R_c)$ is an *a priori* unknown function. Expression (3.6) is the most general for a metric manifold $\mathbf{M}^3$ having spherical symmetry about some arbitrary point $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$.

Considering (3.4), the distance $R_p = |\overline{OQ}|$ from the point at the centre of spherical symmetry O to a point $Q \in \Sigma$, is given by

$$R_p = \int_0^r dr = r = R_c.$$

Call R_p the proper radius. Consequently, in the case of $\mathbf{E}^3$, R_p and R_c are identical, and so the Gaussian curvature at any point in any spherically symmetric geodesic surface in $\mathbf{E}^3$ can be associated with R_p, the radial distance between the centre of spherical symmetry at the point $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$ and the point $Q \in \Sigma$. Thus, in this case, $K = 1/R_c^2 = 1/R_p^2 = 1/r^2$. However, this is not a general relation, since according to (3.5) and (3.6), in the case of $\mathbf{M}^3$, the geodesic radial distance from the centre of spherical symmetry at the point $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$ is not the same as the radius of Gaussian curvature of any spherically symmetric geodesic surface in $\mathbf{M}^3$, about $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$, but by

$$R_p = \int_0^{R_p} dR_p = \int_{R_c(0)}^{R_c(r)} \sqrt{B(R_c(r))}\, dR_c(r) = \int_0^r \sqrt{B(R_c(r))}\, \frac{dR_c(r)}{dr} dr,$$

where $R_c(0)$ is *a priori* unknown owing to the fact that $R_c(r)$ is *a priori* unknown. One cannot simply assume that because $0 \leq r < \infty$ in (3.4) that it must follow that in (3.5) and (3.6) $0 \leq R_c(r) < \infty$. In other words, one cannot simply assume that $R_c(0) = 0$. Furthermore, it is evident from (3.5) and (3.6) that R_p determines the radial geodesic distance from the centre of spherical symmetry at the arbitrary point O' in $\mathbf{M}^3$ (and correspondingly so from O in $\mathbf{E}^3$) to another point in $\mathbf{M}^3$. Clearly, R_c does not in general render the radial geodesic length from the centre of spherical symmetry to some other point in a metric manifold. Only in the particular case of $\mathbf{E}^3$ does R_c render both the Gaussian curvature of any spherically symmetric geodesic surface in $\mathbf{E}^3$ about O in $\mathbf{E}^3$ and the radial distance from the centre of spherical symmetry $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$, owing to the fact that R_p and R_c are identical in that special case.

It should also be noted that in writing expressions (3.4) and (3.5) it is implicit that $O \in \mathbf{E}^3$ is defined as being located at the origin of the coordinate system of (3.4), i.e. O is located where $r = 0$, and by correspondence O' is defined as being located at the origin of the coordinate system of (3.5) and of (3.6), $O' \in \mathbf{M}^3$ is located where $R_p = 0$. Furthermore, since it is well known that a geometry is completely determined by the form of the line element describing it [2], expressions (3.4), (3.5) and (3.6) share the very same fundamental geometry because they are line elements of the same form. Expression (3.6) plays an important rôle in Einstein's gravitational field.

The standard solution in the case of the static vacuum field (i.e. no deformation of the space) allegedly due to a single gravitating body, satisfying Einstein's field equations $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$, is (using $G = c = 1$),

$$ds^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) dt^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 - r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \qquad (3.8)$$

where m is allegedly the mass causing the field, and upon which it is routinely claimed that $2m < r < \infty$ is an exterior region and $0 < r < 2m$ is an interior region. Notwithstanding the inequalities it is routinely allowed that $r = 2m$ and $r = 0$ by which it is also routinely claimed that $r = 2m$ marks a "removable" or "coordinate" singularity and that $r = 0$ marks a "true" or "physical" singularity.

The standard treatment proceeds from simple inspection of (3.8) and the following unproven assumptions:

(a) that r is the radial geodesic distance ($r = 2m$ is even routinely called the "Schwarzschild radius" or the "gravitational radius");

(b) that r can approach zero, even though the line-element (3.8) is singular at $r = 2m$;

(c) that only the first two components of the metric tensor (i.e. g_{00} and g_{11}) are influenced by the quantity $2m$.

With these unstated assumptions, but assumptions nonetheless, it is usual procedure to develop and treat of black holes. However, all three assumptions are demonstrably false at an elementary level.

3.4 Gaussian curvature

In the usual interpretation of Hilbert's [3, 4, 5] version of Schwarzschild's solution, the quantity r therein has ***never*** been properly identified. The physicists have variously and vaguely called it "*the radius*" of a sphere [6, 7], the "*radius of a 2-sphere*" [8], the "*coordinate radius*"[9], the "*radial coordinate*" [10, 11], the "*radial space coordinate*" [12], the "*areal radius*" [9, 13], the "*reduced circumference*" [14], and even "*a gauge choice: it defines the coordinate r*" [15], and it is effectively treated by the physicists as the radial geodesic distance despite the various vague names they apply to it. Indeed, in the particular case of $r = 2m = 2GM/c^2$ it is invariably referred to by the physicists as the "*Schwarzschild radius*" or the "*gravitational radius*". However, the irrefutable geometrical fact is that r, in the spatial section of Hilbert's version of the Schwarzschild/Droste line-element, is the inverse square root of the Gaussian curvature (i.e. the radius of Gaussian curvature) of any spherically symmetric geodesic surface in the spatial section [1, 16, 17], and as such it ***does not*** in fact determine the geodesic radial distance from the centre of spherical symmetry located at an arbitrary point in the related pseudo-Riemannian metric manifold. It does not in fact directly determine any distance at all in the spherically symmetric metric manifold. It is the radius of Gaussian curvature merely by virtue of its formal geometric relationship to the Gaussian curvature. It must also be emphasized that a geometry is completely determined by the ***form*** of its line-element, a fact that the physicists, with few exceptions [2], have not realised.

It immediately follows from the invalidity of $Ric = 0$ that Einstein's conceptions of the conservation and localisation of gravitational energy are erroneous and that the current international search for Einstein's gravitational waves is ill-conceived. Also, the concepts of black holes and their interactions are ill-conceived since the two-body problem has been neither correctly formulated nor solved by means of the General Theory of Relativity.

Recall that Hilbert's corruption of Schwarzschild's solution, erroneously called "Schwarzschild's solution", is (using $c = G = 1$),

$$ds^2 = \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right) dt^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2m}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 - r^2 \left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2\right), \qquad (4.1)$$

wherein r can, by assumption (i.e. without any proof), in some way or another, go down to zero, and m is allegedly the mass causing the gravitational field. Schwarzschild's [18] actual solution, for comparision, is

$$ds^2 = \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{R}\right) dt^2 - \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{R}\right)^{-1} dR^2 - R^2 \left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2\right), \qquad (4.2)$$

$$R = R(r) = \left(r^3 + \alpha^3\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad 0 < r < \infty,$$
$$\alpha = const.$$

Note that (4.2) is singular only when $r = 0$ (in which case the metric does not actually apply), and that the constant α is indeterminable (Schwarzschild did not assign any value to the constant α for this reason).

For a 2-D spherically symmetric geometric surface [19] determined by

$$ds^2 = R_c^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2), \tag{4.3}$$
$$R_c = R_c(r),$$

the Riemannian curvature (which depends upon both position and direction) reduces to the Gaussian curvature K (which depends only upon position), given by [1, 20, 21, 22, 23],

$$K = \frac{R_{1212}}{g},$$

where $R_{ijkm} = g_{in} R^{n}_{\cdot jkm}$ is the Riemann tensor of the first kind and $g = g_{11} g_{22} = g_{\theta\theta} g_{\varphi\varphi}$ (because the metric tensor is diagonal). Recall that

$$R^{1}_{\cdot 212} = \frac{\partial \Gamma^1_{22}}{\partial x^1} - \frac{\partial \Gamma^1_{21}}{\partial x^2} + \Gamma^k_{22}\Gamma^1{}_{k1} - \Gamma^k{}_{21}\Gamma^1_{k2},$$

$$\Gamma^\alpha_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\alpha} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\beta}\left(\frac{1}{2}\ln|g_{\alpha\alpha}|\right),$$

$$\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\beta} = -\frac{1}{2g_{\alpha\alpha}}\frac{\partial g_{\beta\beta}}{\partial x^\alpha}, \quad (\alpha \neq \beta),$$

and all other $\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\gamma}$ vanish. In the above, $k, \alpha, \beta = 1, 2$, $x^1 = \theta$ and $x^2 = \phi$, of course. Straightforward calculation gives for expression (4.3),

$$K = \frac{1}{R_c^2},$$

so that R_c is, in accordance with **Section 3.3** above, the inverse square root of the Gaussian curvature, i. e. the radius of Gaussian curvature, and so r in Hilbert's "Schwarzschild's solution" is the radius of Gaussian curvature of any spherically symmetric geodesic surface in the spatial section, about the arbitrary point where $R_p = 0$. The geodesic (i.e. proper) radius, R_p, of the spatial section of Schwarzschild's solution (4.2), up to a constant of integration, is given by

$$R_p = \int \frac{dR(r)}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{\alpha}{R(r)}}}, \tag{4.4}$$

and for Hilbert's "Schwarzschild's solution" (4.1), by

$$R_p = \int \frac{dr}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2m}{r}}}.$$

Thus the proper radius and the radius of Gaussian curvature ***are not the same***. The radius of Gaussian curvature does not determine the geodesic radial distance from the arbitrary point at the centre of spherical symmetry of the metric manifold. It is a "radius" only in the sense of it being the inverse square root of the Gaussian curvature of a spherically symmetric geodesic surface in the spatial section.

Note that in (4.2), if $\alpha = 0$ Minkowski space is recovered:

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - dr^2 - r^2 \left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2\right),$$

$$0 \le r < \infty.$$

In this case the radius of Gaussian curvature is r and the proper radius is

$$R_p = \int_0^r dr = r,$$

so that the radius of Gaussian curvature and the proper radius are identical. It is for this reason that in the spacetime of Minkowski the radius of Gaussian curvature of the spherically symmetric geodesic surface in the spatial section can be substituted for the proper radius (i.e. the geodesic radius) of the spatial section. However, in the case of a pseudo-Riemannian manifold, such as (4.1) and (4.2) above, only the great circumference and the surface area can be directly determined via the radius of Gaussian curvature. Distances from the arbitrary point at the centre of spherical symmetry to a geodesic spherical surface in a Riemannian metric manifold can only be determined via the proper radius, except for particular points (if any) in the manifold where the radius of Gaussian curvature and the geodesic radius happen to be numerically identical, and volumes by a triple integral involving a function of the radius of Gaussian curvature. In the case of Schwarzschild's solution (4.2) (and hence also for (4.1)), the radius of Gaussian curvature, $R_c = R(r)$, and the proper radius, R_p, are numerically identical only at $R_c \approx 1.467\alpha$. When the radius of Gaussian curvature, R_c, is greater than $\approx 1.467\alpha$, $R_p > R_c$, and when the radius of Gaussian curvature is less than $\approx 1.467\alpha$, $R_p < R_c$.

The upper and lower bounds on the Gaussian curvature (and hence on the radius of Gaussian curvature) are not arbitrary, but are determined by the proper radius in accordance with the intrinsic geometric structure of the line-element (which completely determines the geometry), manifest in the integral (4.4). Thus, one cannot merely assume, as the black hole physicists have done, that the radius of Gaussian curvature for (4.1) and (4.2) can vary from zero to infinity. Indeed, in the case of (4.2) (and hence also of (4.1)), as R_p varies from zero to infinity, the Gaussian curvature of the related spherically symmetric geodesic surface in the spatial section varies from $1/\alpha^2$ to zero and so the radius of Gaussian curvature correspondingly varies from α to infinity, as easily determined by evaluation of the constant of integration associated with the indefinite integral (4.4). Moreover, in the same way, it is easily shown that expressions (4.1) and (4.2) can be generalised [17] to all real values, but one, of the variable r, so that both (4.1) and (4.2) are particular cases of the general radius of Gaussian curvature, given by

$$R_c = R_c(r) = \left(\left|r - r_0\right|^n + \alpha^n\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}, \tag{4.5}$$

$$r \in \Re, \quad n \in \Re^+, \quad r \ne r_0,$$

wherein r_0 and n are entirely arbitrary constants. Choosing $n=3$, $r_0=0$ and $r > r_0$ yields Schwarzschild's solution (4.2). Choosing $n=1$, $r_0=\alpha$ and $r > r_0$ yields line-element (4.1) as determined by Johannes Droste [24] in May 1916, independently of Schwarzschild. Choosing $n=1$, $r_0=\alpha$ and $r < r_0$ gives $R_c=2\alpha-r$, with line-element

$$ds^2 = \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha - r}\right) dt^2 - \left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha - r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 - (2\alpha - r)^2 \left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2\right).$$

Using relations (4.5) directly, all real values of $r \neq r_0$ are permitted. In any case, however, the related line-element is singular only at the arbitrary parametric point $r=r_0$ on the real line (or half real line, as the case may be), which is the only parametric point on the real line (or half real line, as the case may be) at which the line-element fails (at $R_p(r_0)=0 \;\forall\; r_0 \;\forall\; n$). Indeed, substituting R_c for $R(r)$ in (4.4), and evaluating the constant of integration gives

$$R_p = \sqrt{R_c\,(R_c - \alpha)} + \alpha \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{R_c} + \sqrt{R_c - \alpha}}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right),$$

where $R_c=R_c(r)$ is given by (4.5). Note that in the Standard Model interpretation of (4.1), only g_{00} and g_{11} are modified by the presence of the constant $2m$. However, according to (4.2) and (4.5) ***all*** the components of the metric tensor are modified by the constant α, and since (4.1) is a particular case of (4.5), all the components of the metric tensor of (4.1) are modified by the constant α as well. There is no possibility for the alleged "event horizon" that is claimed to characterise a black hole.

The Kruskal-Szekeres coordinates do not take into account the Gaussian curvature of the spherically symmetric geodesic surface in the spatial section of the Schwarzschild manifold. These coordinates thereby violate the geometric form of the line-element, producing a completely separate pseudo-Riemannian manifold that does not form part of the solution space of the Schwarzschild manifold [25], and are consequently invalid. The concept of the Black Hole is therefore invalid.

3.5 The prohibition of infinitely dense point-mass singularities

The black hole is alleged to contain an infinitely dense singularity. The cosmological singularity of the alleged Big Bang cosmology is, according to many proponents of the Big Bang, also infinitely dense. Yet according to Special Relativity, infinite densities are forbidden because their existence implies that a material object can acquire the speed of light c in vacuo (or equivalently, the existence of infinite energies), thereby violating the very basis of Special Relativity. Since General Relativity cannot violate Special Relativity, General Relativity must thereby also forbid infinite densities. Point-mass singularities are alleged to be infinitely dense objects. Therefore, point-mass singularities are forbidden by the Theory of Relativity.

Let a cuboid rest-mass m_0 have sides of length L_0. Let m_0 have a relative speed $v < c$ in the direction of one of three mutually orthogonal Cartesian axes attached to an observer of rest-mass M_0. According to the observer M_0, the moving mass m is

$$m = \frac{m_0}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}}, \tag{5.1}$$

and the volume V thereof is

$$V = L_0^3 \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}. \tag{5.2}$$

Thus, the density D is

$$D = \frac{m}{V} = \frac{m_0}{L_0^3 \left(1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}\right)}, \tag{5.3}$$

and so $v \to c \;\Rightarrow\; D \to \infty$. Since by (5.1) no material object can acquire the speed c (this would require an infinite energy), infinite densities are forbidden by Special Relativity, and so point-mass singularities are forbidden. Since General Relativity cannot violate Special Relativity, it too must thereby forbid infinite densities and hence forbid point-mass singularities [3, 17, 18]. Point-charges too are therefore forbidden by the Theory of Relativity since there can be no charge without mass.

It is nowadays routinely claimed that many black holes have been found. The signatures of the black hole are (a) an infinitely dense 'point-mass' singularity and (b) an event horizon. Nobody has ever found an infinitely dense 'point-mass' singularity and nobody has ever found an event horizon, so nobody has ever assuredly found a black hole. It takes an infinite amount of observer time to verify a black hole event horizon. Nobody has been around and nobody will be around for an infinite amount of time and so no observer can ever verify the presence of an event horizon, and hence a black hole, in principle, and so the notion is irrelevant to physics. All reports of black holes being found are patently false.

3.6 *Ric* = 0 is inadmissible

According to Einstein [26], his 'Principle of Equivalence' (equivalence of gravitational and inertial mass) requires that Special Relativity manifest in any freely falling inertial frame located in a sufficiently small region of the gravitational field. Now Special Relativity permits the presence of arbitrarily large (but not infinite) masses in spacetime, which are subject to the mass dilation relation (expression (5.1) above; and hence also to expressions (5.2) and (5.3) as well), and the definition of a relativistic inertial frame requires the *a priori* presence of two masses; the mass of the observer and the mass of the observed (to define relative motion of material bodies). In addition, at any instant the masses defining the freely falling inertial frame (and hence any other masses present therein) can have a speed up to but not including the speed of light in vacuo, by the action of the gravitational field. However, $Ric = R_{\mu\nu} = 0$ precludes, by definition, the presence of any masses and energies in the gravitational field because the energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ by hypothesis. Therefore, Special Relativity cannot manifest in any "freely falling" inertial frame in the spacetime of $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$. Indeed, a "freely falling" inertial frame cannot even be present since its very definition requires the presence of two masses which are, at any instant, subject to mass dilation under the action of the gravitational field. Similarly the equivalence of gravitational and inertial mass cannot manifest in the absence of matter in the gravitational field. Thus, $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$ violates Einstein's 'Principle of Equivalence' and is therefore inadmissible – it does not describe Einstein's gravitational field. Matter can only be introduced into Einstein's gravitational field via the energy-momentum tensor since it alone is what specifies that which physically causes the curvature of spacetime (i.e. the gravitational field). Clearly, the standard *a posteriori* and *ad hoc* introduction of matter as the physical cause of spacetime curvature, into the so-called "Schwarzschild solution" for $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$, violates the requirements of Einstein's theory because the energy-momentum tensor is set to zero in that case.

3.7 Gravitational energy cannot be localised

Since $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$ does not describe Einstein's gravitational field, the energy-momentum tensor can never be zero (i.e. if $T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ there is no gravitational field), so Einstein's field equations

$$G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} R = -\kappa T_{\mu\nu}$$

can be written as [20, 27, 28]

$$\frac{1}{\kappa} G_{\mu\nu} + T_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{7.1}$$

wherein the $G_{\mu\nu}/\kappa$ are the components of a gravitational energy tensor. Thus, $G_{\mu\nu}/\kappa$ and $T_{\mu\nu}$ *vanish identically*; the total energy is always zero; there is no localisation of gravitational energy (i.e. there are no Einstein gravitational waves). The current international search for Einstein's gravitational waves is destined to detect nothing. Furthermore, Einstein's General Theory of Relativity violates the experimentally established usual conservation of energy and momentum. Thus, if the usual conservation of energy and momentum is valid (there is no experimental data to suggest otherwise), then Einstein's General Theory of Relativity is invalid, and hence the FRW line-element and Big Bang Cosmology are false.

It is of interest to note that Einstein's pseudo-tensor is frequently utilised as a basis for the localisation of gravitational energy [2, 11, 20, 26, 29, 30]. From the foregoing it is evident that this cannot be correct. This is reaffirmed by the fact that Einstein's pseudo-tensor is mathematically (and hence also physically) meaningless, because it implies the existence of an invariant that has no mathematical existence [28]. Indeed, Einstein's pseudo-tensor, $\sqrt{-g}\, t^{\mu}_{\nu}$, is defined as [2, 11, 20, 26, 28, 29, 30],

$$\sqrt{-g}\, t^{\mu}_{\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\delta^{\mu}_{\nu} L - \frac{\partial L}{\partial g^{\sigma\rho}_{,\mu}} g^{\sigma\rho}_{,\nu} \right)$$

wherein L is given by

$$L = -g^{\alpha\beta} \left(\Gamma^{\gamma}_{\alpha\kappa} \Gamma^{\kappa}_{\beta\gamma} - \Gamma^{\gamma}_{\alpha\beta} \Gamma^{\kappa}_{\gamma\kappa} \right).$$

Contracting the pseudo-tensor and applying Euler's theorem yields,

$$\sqrt{-g}\, t^{\mu}_{\mu} = L,$$

which is a 1st-order intrinsic differential invariant that depends only upon the components of the metric tensor and their 1st derivatives. However, the mathematicians G. Ricci-Curbastro and T. Levi-Civita [31] proved in 1900 that such invariants ***do not exist***! Consequently, everything built upon Einstein's pseudo-tensor is invalid. Eddington's [30] other objections to the pseudo-tensor are therefore quite well-founded.

Similarly, Einstein's field equations cannot be linearised because linearisation implies the existence of a tensor that, except for the trivial case of being precisely zero, ***does not otherwise exist***, as proven by Hermann Weyl [32] in 1944.

Since it has already been proven elsewhere [33] that the so-called "cosmological constant" must be precisely zero, expression (7.1) can contain no other terms.

References

[1] Levi-Civita T. The Absolute Differential Calculus, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1977.

[2] Tolman R. C. Relativity Thermodynamics and Cosmology, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1987.

[3] Abrams L. S. Black holes: the legacy of Hilbert's error. *Can. J. Phys.*, v. 67, 919, 1989, (arXiv:gr-qc/0102055), (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/Abrams1989.pdf).

[4] Antoci S. David Hilbert and the origin of the "Schwarzschild" solution. 2001, (arXiv:physics/0310104).

[5] Loinger A. On black holes and gravitational waves. La Goliardica Paves, Pavia, 2002.

[6] Mould R. A. Basic Relativity, Springer–Verlag New York Inc., New York, 1994.

[7] Dodson, C. T. J., Poston, T. Tensor Geometry – The Geometric Viewpoint and its Uses, 2nd Ed., Springer–Verlag, 1991.

[8] Bruhn G. W. (public communication), (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/BHLetters.html).

[9] Wald R. M. General Relativity, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984.

[10] Carroll B. W., Ostile, D. A. An Introduction to Modern Astrophysics, Addison–Wesley Publishing Company Inc., 1996.

[11] Misner C. W., Thorne K. S., Wheeler, J. A. Gravitation, W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1970.

[12] Zel'dovich Ya. B., Novikov I. D. Stars and Relativity, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1996.

[13] Ludvigsen M. General Relativity – A Geometric Approach, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999.

[14] Taylor E. F., Wheeler J. A. Exploring Black Holes — Introduction to General Relativity, Addison Wesley Longman, 2000 (in draft).

[15] 't Hooft G. (private communication) (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/BHLetters.html).

[16] Schwarzschild K. On the gravitational field of a sphere of incompressible fluid according to Einstein's theory. *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., Phys. Math. Kl.*, 424, 1916, (arXiv: physics/9912033).

[17] Crothers S. J. On the geometry of the general solution for the vacuum field of the point-mass. *Progress in Physics*, v. 2, 3–14, 2005, (www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2005/PP-02-01.PDF).

[18] Schwarzschild K. On the gravitational field of a mass point according to Einstein's theory. *Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., Phys. Math. Kl.*, 189, 1916, (arXiv: physics/9905030), (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/schwarzschild.pdf).

[19] O'Niell B. Elementary Differential Geometry, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1966.

[20] Pauli W. The Theory of Relativity, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1981.

[21] Kay D. C. Theory and Problems of Tensor Calculus, Schaum's Outline Series, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1988.

[22] McConnell A. J. Applications of Tensor Analysis, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1957.

[23] Landau L., Lifshitz E. The Classical Theory of Fields, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., Reading, Massachusettes, 1951.

[24] Droste J. The field of a single centre in Einsteins theory of gravitation, and the motion of a particle in that field, *Ned. Acad. Wet., S. A.*, 1917, v. 19, 197, (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/Droste.pdf).

[25] Smoller J., Temple B. On the Oppenheimer-Volkoff equations in General Relativity, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, Springer-Verlag, 1998, 142, 177.

[26] Einstein A. The Meaning of Relativity, Science Paperbacks and Methuen & Co. Ltd., 156–157, 1967.

[27] Lorentz H. A. *Versl. gewone Vergad. Akad. Amst.*, 25, 468 and 1380, 1916.

[28] Levi-Civita T. Mechanics. - On the analytical expression that must be given to the gravitational tensor in Einsteins theory. *Rendiconti della Reale Accadmeia dei Lincei*, 26, 381, 1917, (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/Levi-Civita.pdf).

[29] Dirac P. A. M. General Theory of Relativity. Princeton Landmarks in Physics Series, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1996.

[30] Eddington A. S. The mathematical theory of relativity, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd edition, 1960.

[31] Ricci-Curbastro G., Levi-Civita T. Méthodes de calcul différential absolu et leurs applications, *Matematische Annalen*, B. 54, 1900, p.162.

[32] Weyl H. How far can one get with a linear field theory of gravitation in flat spacetime?, *Amer. J. Math.*, 66, 591, 1944, (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/weyl-1.pdf).

[33] Crothers S. J. On the general solution to Einstein's vacuum field for the point-mass when $\lambda \neq 0$ and its consequences for relativistic cosmology. *Progress in Physics*, v.3, 7–18, 2005, (www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2005/PP-03-02.PDF).

[34] McVittie G. C. Laplace's alleged "black hole". *The Observatory*, v.98, 272, 1978, (www.sjcrothers.plasmaresources.com/McVittie.pdf).

[35] Crothers S. J. A Brief History of Black Holes. *Progress in Physics*, v.2, 54–57, 2006, (www.ptep-online.com/index_files/2006/PP-05-10.PDF).