

## 239(8): Comparison of Experimental, Michowski and Einstein Precessions.

From eq. (38) of note 239(7) the Michowski precession is approximated by:  $\Delta\theta \sim \pi \left(\frac{v}{c}\right)^2$  — (1)

where  $v$  is the orbital velocity and  $c$  the speed of light.

The Einstein precession is given by:

$$\Delta\theta = \frac{6\pi GM}{ac^2(1-e^2)} \quad \text{--- (2)}$$

where  $G$  is Newton's constant,  $M$  is the mass of the sun,  $a$  the semi major axis and  $e$  the eccentricity. Contemporary high precision ephemeris data claim to give  $\Delta\theta$  with great precision. It is difficult to find the relevant data by a web site search, but there is one site that gives the data for the experimentally observed total perihelia precession of the planets:

[www.farside.ph.utexas.edu](http://www.farside.ph.utexas.edu)

However the site gives results that are far too small. Assuming that this is a typographical error the correct results are:

Table 1: Experimental Data

Planet	$v(m s^{-1})$	$\Delta\theta$ (observed) (arcsec/century)
Mercury	$4.787 \times 10^4$	5750
Venus	$3.502 \times 10^4$	2040
Earth	$2.978 \times 10^4$	11450
Mars	$2.408 \times 10^4$	16280
Jupiter	$1.307 \times 10^4$	6550
Saturn	$0.969 \times 10^4$	19500
Uranus	$0.681 \times 10^4$	3340
Neptune	$0.543 \times 10^4$	360

1) The Michowski and Einstein precessions are as follows, in arc seconds per century:

Planet	Michowski	Einstein	Observed
Mercury	1.65	42.195	5750
Venus	0.89	8.6186	2040
Earth	0.64	3.8345	11450
Mars	0.42	1.3502	16280
Jupiter	0.30	0.0623	6550
Saturn	0.165	0.0137	19500
Uranus	0.03	0.0024	3340
Neptune	0.02	0.0008	360

1) It is claimed in standard physics that Einstein reduces to Michowski in the limit.

But for the outer planet Neptune it is seen that the Michowski precession is ten times greater than the Einstein precession. So there is a fatal internal self incasivness in the Einstein theory.

2) It is claimed in the standard physics that it is possible to calculate the gravitational effect of all planets on the perihelia precession of the orbit of a given planet. This is done with



3) N planet perturbation theory, but using the Newtonian force law:

$$\underline{F} = - \frac{mMG}{r^2} \underline{e}_r \quad - (4)$$

This is an inconsistent and self inconsistent procedure. In order to be self consistent with Einsteinian general relativity the EGR force law should be used in the N planet perturbation code:

$$\underline{F} = \left( - \frac{mMG}{r^2} \underline{e}_r - \frac{3L_0^2 MG}{mc^2 r^4} \right) \underline{e}_r \quad - (5)$$

(eq. (11) of note 239(b)). The standard physics incorrectly uses eq. (4) to arrive at an "anomaly" that is claimed to be described precisely by eq. (5). For Saturn for example the observed precession is 19,500 arc seconds a century, but the Einstein theory gives 0.0137 arc seconds a century. It is claimed that Newtonian N planet perturbation theory is precise enough to give exactly 19499.9863 arc seconds per century.

This is simply not a credible claim. The precision needed is about one part in ten to the power seven.

Furthermore, some papers claim that the experimental anomaly is precisely the same as the Einstein value, which means that the N planet

t) Newtonian perturbation theory must be accurate to about  
or part in ten to the power nine.

For Mercury on the other hand the total  
observed perihelia precession is 5750 arc seconds per  
century, compared with the Einstein claim of  
42.195 arc seconds per century. In this case it is  
claimed that the Newtonian N planet perturbation theory is  
5707.805 arc seconds per century. This is an accuracy of only one part  
in a hundred, or if it is claimed that the "anomaly"  
is the same exactly as the Einstein result, 42.195 arc  
seconds per century, an accuracy of about one part in ten  
power seven.

It is very unlikely that an N planet  
perturbation procedure can produce such accuracies,  
and the perturbation code is based on the wrong  
force law, eq. (4). The claim of standard  
physics is that EGR is a precise universal law  
of gravitation, so it must be used in calculating  
all precession contributions. If this is done  
correctly the Einstein theory fails completely.

---