

Einstein, Red-Handed!

Emile Braunthal Weisman

Heurtey Group, France

Corresponding authors

Emile Braunthal Weisman, Heurtey Group, France.

Received: August 11, 2026; Accepted: August 17, 2026; Published: August 24, 2026

Abstract

The theories of Relativity and quantum mechanics have invaded the field of Education and Science without ever proving their effectiveness and usefulness. Thousands of researchers have been stalling for a century without any notable results, despite the praise of their supporters.

We also show that the *Curvature of Space*, one of the bases of Einstein's theory of Relativity, is false and results from a confusion between the role of space as a material entity and the role of the gravitational force.

Keywords: Theory of Relativity, Einstein, Curvature of Space, Snell-Descartes, Refraction, Eddington, Charlie Chaplin, Newton, gravitational force

Einstein, Red-handed!

If I tell you that Einstein cheated, you'll think that I'm a joker, that I don't know anything about it, that anyway what Einstein said is so much above our heads that you have to be supremely intelligent to understand it and even more so to flush out a mistake or a malice.

But like yourself, you consider yourself *not too stupid*, even *intelligent*, which I readily admit, it is therefore your intelligence that I appeal to!

Let's take a first example

Einstein tells us that space is curved, but he admits that this curvature is due to the presence of mass. **It is therefore not an intrinsic property of space** but a consequence of the presence of a massive object. As proof of his assertion, he tells us that in the vicinity of a mass, light rays do not propagate in a straight line, they are curved. So, we agree, *space itself is nothing special*, it is Newton's force that bends, not space but the trajectories of objects in transit in space. In the absence of a massive object, light or any other creature would flutter happily in a straight line.

And he explains: according to the Theory of General Relativity, a ray of light *must undergo in a gravitational field a curvature*

analogous to that which must undergo the trajectory of a body thrown through a gravitational field. A ray of light grazing a celestial body is, according to the theory, deflected towards it; the angle of deflection α for a ray of light which passes at a distance from the sun equal to Δ rays of the sun (his formula p. 182):

$$\alpha = \frac{1,7'' d' arc}{\Delta}$$

And he specifies: this deviation is due half to the sun's (Newtonian) field of attraction and half to the geometric modification of space (curvature) produced by the sun. It should be noted that Einstein does not explain why or how this relativistic deviation is produced. It should also be noted that in his speech, Einstein appropriated this deviation as a consequence of his theory: *according to the Theory of General Relativity*, and no longer as a consequence of the presence of a serious mass.

It should be remembered that Newton's classical mechanics also predicted a deflection of light (treating it as a corpuscle of zero mass but finite energy), but its value was exactly half that predicted by Einstein (about 0.87''), which forced Einstein to admit these two forms of curvature.

Are we to understand that the sun's gravitational field acts in two different ways, by distorting space and bending trajectories? Moreover, the result obtained by Einstein is not the result of the calculation of his formula, it seems to be one (or the) reason why

he did not give the exact formula but only the result he wanted to obtain: It is interesting to go through this formula. How does he get it? Why does he not set it out in this numerically equivalent way to the above:

$$\alpha = \frac{2\pi GM}{Rc^2}$$

If we solve this formula numerically, we get 2.74" and not 1.74" of arc. An expression in which G is the constant of gravitation, M is the mass of the sun, R is its radius and c is the speed of light. Was Einstein aware of this difference?

In this equation we would find the force of attraction of the sun which would justify the curvature, but Einstein did not introduce GM/R for this purpose. What interested him is that these 3 factors together represent the square of a velocity ($GM/R = v^2$), the velocity of an object in gravitation on the surface of the sun can be, which allows him to tell us that this deviation must be, more or less, equal to the famous ratio he serves us in all sauces: v^2/c^2 . And for what other reason did he invoke this force squared? The square of a force is nonsense.

But let's still assume that this deviation is proportional to v^2/c^2 , where does the factor 0.62 that must be introduced into this equation to obtain the desired result come from? Probably from his hat because he doesn't justify it anywhere.

But another question arises: could Einstein and his followers, Eddington in particular, not know the Snell-Descartes proposal on diffraction? Could they believe that the sun does not have an atmosphere capable of deflecting the rays of light from distant stars when, even at the time, this phenomenon was obvious and sometimes even annoying?

Here we see a sample of Einstein's bluff. Let's admit that he may not be entirely responsible for it. The difficulties in explaining the results of Michelson and Morley's experiments at the end of the 19th century may have favored the acceptance of his proposals by a scientific community in search of sensationalism after the opening of a small window on the cosmos. This acceptance was all the more fostered by the fact that at the time no one understood Einstein but no one dared to admit it.

Yes, of course, but since a century?

Come on, the damned of Physics, stand up, stand up...

For a century, only those who swear by the Theory of Relativity and Quantum Mechanics have been allowed to be heard. They tell us that these theories have changed our vision of the world but as Bohr said, don't try to understand Quantum Mechanics, it is incomprehensible, it only allows you to calculate. Einstein once said to Chaplin, "The wonderful thing is that you don't say a word and everyone understands you" and Chaplin replied, "The wonderful thing is that no one understands you but everyone applauds you."

Yes, current theories are indeed misunderstood or not understood at all, especially by those who claim their beauty and interest. For a century, thousands of scientists, sometimes of great value, have been looking for dark matter, dark energy, gray matter, black holes, fusion, the boson of this, the quark of that... with smoky and unverifiable theories by swearing that one day, they will understand the first moments of the Universe. What a great deal! While they are unable to understand that Newton's force of attraction never ceases to act and that as a result our planet, the sun and all the stars are in perpetual growth [1].

There are thousands of us who want a clear and deterministic Physics, we refuse to enter into the game of sterile fantasies, we are thousands who refuse to prostrate ourselves before oracles with abstruse speeches that can only seduce yes-men, we are thousands who oppose the stranglehold of the proponents of current theories on Teaching to preserve the younger generations from useless and sterile programs such as "Set Theory" or that of "Modern Math's".

Unfortunately, the opponents of current theories are in a Tower of Babel. Everyone has their own speech and the result is inaudible. No consensus is possible because everyone is convinced that he is the only one to show the way forward and remain deaf or incompetent to understand the proposals of his colleagues.

*I may be one of them, but I have proposed, not a new theory because what I am proposing is verifiable, but a framework for understanding the atom and radiation. My proposals are detailed in my books **Atoms and Matter, Stars and Gravitation and Anti Quantum**. As we can verify, they are much simpler and in total rupture with the theses on which tens of thousands of physicists have been trampling for a century. I dare to hope that these proposals will be the basis of a consensus allowing the advent of a concrete and deterministic Physics. Any cooperation would therefore be welcome.*

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

1. Einstein. Theory of Restraint and General relativity. Gauthier-Villars. 1954.