

Einstein Space-Time Model Relevance

By: Donald T. Kasper 10/30/2025

Strong Models and Weak Models

There are two types of science models we encounter. There are very rare strong models that take all available data and explains it all, and with that it confidently predicts things we look for and subsequently find. One such model is the Periodic Table of the Elements. This has withstood over 100 years of study and helps to organize the matter we see, explains behaviors, and helps us use these elements.

Then there are weak models. These explain one thing in the system under study, explain nothing else, and the author/s then quietly just dump aside by never discussing the data that contradicts or is not properly or fully explained by the model and often is not explained at all. Extrapolation of these models to predict other things has low reliability. The author contends that most of our science is comprised of weak models.

When Noise Becomes Data

Over time we are witness to noise becoming data. A blob that looks to the author like a Fourier transform construct at (0,0) origin location in an image now proves it is a black hole because the structure is round. This image as one scientist (Robitaille, a physicist) complained took one megabyte of data out of one petabyte (1×10^6), not even one percent for that image and just dumped in the trash the rest of the data.

It is so bad we have constructs of dark matter and dark energy and just plain dark data comprising 98% of the universe being therefore unexplained while our "model" of gravity running the universe uses the remaining 2%. Back in the early 1900's that 2% was called noise, but not anymore.

Infinites

What is real? What does real mean? A good example is the math concept of infinity. It literally means "et cetera," that the function continues forever. Our math is full of infinities and so is our science, but our science uses this to place a social construct tag to explain things we have no answers for. A case study is the origin of the universe that came from an infinity, the universe is infinitely wide, it expands forever into infinity, and it may be infinitely old. On top of that, it can disappear into infinity via an infinite number of black holes, which are themselves infinite structures.

The author argues that there are actually no infinities in the universe, and as such, the big bang, black holes, dimensions of the universe are all math assumptions but not observations. If math predicts an infinity does not prove it exists. If we study a maple leaf, we can probably define a fractal math function that fits the shape of that leaf. Now, we can generate that function in a computer, visualize it, and traverse deeper forever in any part of that leaf-like fractal. In reality, are the edges of maple leaves infinitely fractal at higher resolutions? The answer is no. Beyond that top level, the leaf is randomly jagged, and no longer fractal. The number of iterations is very small, the initial value, maybe one more iterations, then something else takes place and the function stops. While leaves do not prove universe parameters, leaves do prove math has very definite limits so it is best used to explain what we see in nature rather than trying to extrapolate universe solutions based on local observations.

Einstein Discovers Planar Gravity

What is particularly fascinating about Einstein's Theory of Relativity is how little it predicts of the behavior of our local solar system. First, space and time are human conventions of exact parameters and as such cannot be mixed, compressed, warped, or combined. They have never been found in nature. Or have they? Do they just sit without recognition in front of us? The author speculates that space is where photons exist. Without photons

there is nothing. So, our universe is where light is. Photons are a form of electrons with different properties but interchange with them regularly. It may just be that photons are a plasma state of electrons dissociated from atoms. The author also speculates that time is a property of photons. The reason why we cannot travel faster than light is not due to Einstein equations showing anything, but rather we cannot exceed the speed of our reference frame itself. It may very well be that the reason there is background microwave radiation at 3 Kelvin is from photons filling space creating this radiant energy and does not indicate a Big Bang event.

Since space and time cannot be mixed, we will just call it deformation of space leading to the behavior we call gravity and not space-time. If we do accept space deformation is why two bodies attract, then we must explain why moons have not fallen in to planets and planets have not fallen in to the sun. It is not due to angular momentum. That is not a force. That is early European observation of behavior. There is something that actually explains this inability of these bodies after 4.5 billion years or more to fall into their larger nearby host masses.

Is curvature of light around stars proof of space deformation? Certainly not. This deformation is only found in the dust in the coronas around stars, and as such, that is caused by refraction. The dust around some stars is found to be quartz, for example. Quartz has a known refractive index that separates light into s- and p-wave components that go through the quartz at different speeds, hence exit at different angles. The light bends due to photons interaction with the electric field lattice of quartz and so depends on the lattice orientation.

We have the planets spinning that Einstein does not explain with relativity. It does not explain why the planets are on one plane instead of randomly placed and orbiting all about on many planes. It does not explain why planet orbits do not cross. It does not explain why all our local planets orbit in the same direction. Even though people scream these orbits are elliptical, come on, under one percent out of round is not an ellipse from a functional standpoint. The orbits are very close to spherical. All Einstein relativity does is say, yes, two bodies stay next to each other, and then they move on with the discussion. This is where the author claims Einstein's model for our solar system is planar gravity because everything is on the plane of the equator of the sun, notwithstanding noting some collisions with planets that turned some planets, flipped some, and pushed some slightly out of this equatorial plane. The overriding master construct is planar orbits of the planets and planar orbits of all moons of their host planets, so this model is locally repeated on a smaller scale as well.

Do we have a strong model that explains all of this? Well clearly yes, and this is where the idea of an electric universe came from. The sun induces a magnetic field, with two poles, a north and south pole. The neutral position, the lowest energy state is on the sun equator in this field and this is where the planets are. The planets orbit in the direction of the orbit of the sun because they are electrically connected. The planets cannot fall into the sun and their paths cannot cross due to like charge repulsion. The auroras of planets show the electric field of the sun connecting to the poles of each planet with an atmosphere to see this plasma discharge and with that the planets spin by induction. Induction occurs from the spinning of the sun. Local moons have the same behaviors with their host planets.

Fields and Forces are Particles in Motion

Fields are not concepts affecting matter. The author contends only matter can affect matter. Yet, modern science acts like fields are things in their own right that exist because of magic. It is clear that the original definition of fields was used to define specific behaviors of objects seen on a large scale. The author contends that fields are matter in motion where a large group of particles behave in uniform, synchronized fashion. Without matter, there is no field behavior. The best example is an electric field which is comprised of free electrons in motion. If electrons are not converted into photons when dissociated from matter, they make fields. Always keep in mind that behaviors of particles are not just so, magic, God, or properties of matter. Something makes matter behave a certain way in all cases. This means, we have a lot more particles to find, but smashing electrons in particle colliders with every higher energy is not how to find them. It seems every time we observe matter behavior, we move along instead of hunting for the particle type that enforces that behavior.

The equivalence to this is forces. When physicists talk of the strong nuclear force and weak nuclear force, this is not magic of the universe doing things to matter, these are behaviors caused by particles in motion so while physicists speculate about the existence of quarks and sadly proclaim their existence to measure is a femtosecond so alas we cannot ever make a kilo of any one to study, in actuality, the next level of particles below protons, electrons, and neutrons are the two that make these forces. You can argue that some single or combination of quarks makes these two behaviors and that is what we are really observing without recognizing it, but since we have only two behaviors there are either more behaviors to be found or there aren't as many quarks as proposed.

The Monodispersion Superstructure of the Universe

What is the overarching universe superstructure no book on astronomy describes, committing not even a single sentence, to document and explain the universe layout? The number one defining feature at the top level is that the stars not in galaxies are a monodispersion. There is just no clumping. We have a very few galactic clusters, mostly spiral shaped galaxies or this monodispersion. What force created and enforces this monodispersion? For every behavior there is not a nothing, a concept enforcing it that are typically labelled as forces. There is something specifically causing it, otherwise these dense stars needed to start coalescing from gravitational attraction. No space-time of Einstein can although all these big suns have lots of mass and hence gravity, but there is one known physical principal that can--monodispersions. This means that if the stars have similar charge they cannot cluster, and infers the few clusters found the stars would not have similar charges, or have no net charge.

Do Galaxies Spin?

I call galactic spin, toilet bowl theory. Because we see toilet bowl water swirling when we push the flush lever, for many this proves that galaxies spin because after all, they look like flushing toilet bowls. But is this fantastical extrapolation from local conditions justified? Well you can say we have light shift studies of galaxies with blue pixels here and red pixels there and this proves spin. Or does it? Each of these truly horrifically shitty images has pixels involving never a single star in a galaxy but everything in the light path, and hundreds of millions of stars in that galaxy.

We can always back off these theories and just apply basic logical tests of their validity. Using no red shift at all, with hundreds of millions to hundreds of billions of stars in each galaxy, and spinning, there is massive blocking and unblocking which means 100% of all galaxies have variable luminosity. So how many do? Is that number something like ten if I remember correctly? Well, clearly, we want to study those more, but we need an actual answer why ten out of a trillion galaxies predicted, and thousands observable without Webb are all that have this behavior.

Kasper's Infrared Spectrum Attribution Principle

The infrared spectrum of the sun proves the sun is a carbon star. Along the way the physicist Robitaille (who invented the MRI machine so understands physics thoroughly) claims the sun is metallic hydrogen, mimicking the structure of carbon and hence the spectrum. The assertion of the author based on 15 years of infrared spectroscopy work is clear: every gas has a unique spectrum; every mineral has a unique spectrum; every carbon compound has a unique spectrum; every chemical has a unique spectrum; every state and crystal form of a substance has a unique spectrum. There is no such thing as two different substances having the same spectrum because of some state condition. Robitaille is wrong. Something is reacting in the sun with many byproducts including carbon, hydrogen, and helium or the sun is a carbon star. If the sun is composed of carbon, clearly there is no fusion process driving the sun. Hydrogen in the photosphere is a problem for a fusion model where hydrogen is fusing to helium. Either this process leaks or these photosphere elements are all byproducts of something else going on.