

## LT, STR and OTR ... for LUBOBA from Okoun

No matter how many kinds of motions there are in the universe (rectilinear, curvilinear, even, uneven, circular, elliptical, and finally chaotic), the theory of relativity only has two motions in mind:

*Even rectilinear* and *uneven rectilinear*. And for them, one basic physics lesson says that: bodies are never at rest in space; the body remains **in uniform rectilinear motion**  $m \cdot v$ , **if** no force acts on it. But that force (at least gravitational) is always omnipresent throughout the Universe and is permanent throughout the entire history of the universe's existence, from age zero to today, and so the gravitational force on every body acts absolutely **always and everywhere**, and so the movement is never uniform rectilinear, is either

- a) **uneven rectilinear** ... or
- b) **uniform curvilinear**, or i
- c) **uneven curvilinear**,

where **basically** all three types of movements are the same according to the chosen Observer as he entered his observation conditions. Nevertheless (!) physicists and physics "allow and dare" to round in calculations (curvature to linearity, and that's not fair); and therefore to claim that the movement of the racket is "sometimes" (sometimes always) **uniform and straight**, which is never realistic in reality. (!) [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g\\_043.pdf](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/g/g_043.pdf) ; [http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/i/i\\_019.doc](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/i/i_019.doc) Physical literature states (and not only here) → [https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lorentzova\\_transformace](https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lorentzova_transformace)) that: The **Lorentz transformation** is a system of equations that allows, using coordinates  $x, y, z, t$ , some event  $/U/$  in =inertial frame of reference=  $S$  to express the same event in another inertial frame with coordinates  $x', y', z', t'$ , to the reference system  $S'$ , **which** relative to the original system  $S$ , **moves speed**  $v$ . If this is the definition, and "essentially complete", then (u) I will object that the definition considers **only** (!) the uniform motion of that (rocket) system  $S'$  placed in the system  $S$ . And unfortunately such a uniform motion with "any  $v_n$ " cannot be achieved without accelerated motion. And this is achieved only in a situation where a force acts on the body... And that (gravitational force) acts everywhere and always.!! ( That's why global space-time is curved, **that's why Hubble's law can't be linear** ). The Lorentz transformation can therefore only be an expression of the "stop-state" of a body in  $S'$  in accelerated motion, i.e. in non-uniform motion, i.e. LT are only stop-states  $v(1) ; v(2) ; v(3) ; v(n) \dots ; v\acute{e} \rightarrow c\acute{e}$ . The real movement of every body in the Universe (if I forget now to consider the micro-universe where QM rules, i.e. the movements of "chaotic boiling equilibrium") is a non-uniform rectilinear ..or uniform curvilinear movement, which is one and the same according to OTR - and that is universal gravitation.

Therefore, the movement (of the rocket) cannot be, strictly speaking, **uniform rectilinear**, so that  $v \rightarrow c$  can also be claimed for it. In each "stop-state" of movement  $v(n) \rightarrow c$  or  $v_i \rightarrow c$  the movement will be uniform rectilinear ..or uniform curvilinear ; at least in the second case, when a body moves along a curve, **its "own" body system  $S'$**  rotates with respect to the  $S$  system...because global gravity curves space-time, the body moves along a curved geodesic, this rotation of the  $S'$  system shows the OTR. But I am convinced that even during non-uniform rectilinear movement, the "own" system of the rocket  $S'$  rotates with respect to the system  $S$ ... The rotation during "stop states" (  $v_i \rightarrow c$  ) is expressed by STR. The omnipresent gravity curves space-time, so let's understand this fact, i.e. movement along the curved dimension spacetime, in such a way that the system  $S'$  **must** rotate with respect to the basic system  $S$ . (the system  $S'$  is equated here with a rocket). This is the reason why in the "transformation" equations - which are only "stop-states" - we read "relativity", i.e. **time dilation and length contraction**, although there are no (!) changes in mass from  $m(0)$  on  $m \dots$

[http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/f/f\\_061.jpg](http://www.hypothesis-of-universe.com/docs/f/f_061.jpg) , because the system **S'** is rotated to the system **S**, so by "scanning" (into the undashed projective ) intervals of both time and length from that **S'** to **S** we always get an interval which, in *perspective of the observer*, is not identical to the unit interval in the system **S**. Summary: Cosmology claims that a quasar at the observability horizon because it has a dilated time  $v \rightarrow c$  mission. But that is nonsense because he-quasar is looking at us and according to him we have  $v \rightarrow c$  and therefore time dilation would have to prevail here on Earth, which we do not observe.

JN 28.05.2019