Comments on Interpretations of the Eötvös Experiment

and

Misinterpretation of $E = Mc^2$

C. Y. Lo
Applied and Pure Research Institute
17 Newcastle Drive, Nashua, NH 03060 USA

November 2005

NOV 2 2005

Abstract

The Eötvös Experiment on the verification of equivalence between inertial mass and gravitational mass of a body is famous for its accuracy. A problem is, however, can these experimental results be applied to the case of a physical space in general relativity, where the space coordinates could be arbitrary? It is pointed out that it can be validly applied because it has been proven that Einstein's equivalence principle implied a physical space must have a frame of reference with the Euclidean-like structure. Will claimed further that such an overall accuracy can to translated into an accuracy of the equivalence between inertial mass and each type of energy. It is shown that, according to general relativity, such a claim is incorrect. The root of this problem is due to an inadequate understanding of special relativity that produced the famous equation $E = m c^2$, which must be understood in terms of energy conservation. Concurrently, it is pointed out that this error is a problem in Will's book, "Theory and experiment in gravitational physics."

04.20.-q, 04.20.Cv

Key Words: Einstein's Equivalence Principle, Einstein-Minkowski Condition, Euclidean-like Structure, Eötvös Experiment, Weak Equivalence Principle, $E = mc^2$.

1. Introduction.

General relativity is established on two principles [1, 2], namely: 1) Einstein's equivalence principle, which requires the Einstein-Minkowski condition that a free falling point-like particle in a gravitational field is along a geodesic and results in a co-moving local Minkowski space; and 2) the principle of general relativity, that is "The law of physics must be of such a nature that they apply to systems of reference in any kind of motion." However, these two principles are practically replaced [3] with Pauli's version of the equivalence principle [4], which requires only a mathematical existence of local Minkowski spaces, and unrestricted covariance, which Einstein called the "principle of covariance" [1], "The general laws of nature are to be expressed by equations which hold good for all systems of co-ordinates, that is, are co-variant with respect to any substitutions whatever (generally co-variant)." Consequently, many accepted Lorentz manifolds are not valid in physics [5].

Einstein's principles actually require a physical meaning of coordinates that Einstein's theory did not provide [1, 2], but the substitutions require no physical meaning of the coordinates. Thus, Einstein's equivalence principle is practically not applicable. Perhaps this is why essentially only the Pauli version, which is a corrupted simplification of theorems in Riemannian geometry, is used beyond Einstein's own work. In spite of Einstein's objection [3], his equivalence principle was commonly but mistakenly regarded the same as Pauli's [4] version:

> "For every infinitely small world region (i.e. a world region which is so small that the space- and time-variation of gravity can be neglected in it) there always exists a coordinate system K_0 (X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4) in which gravitation has no influence either in the motion of particles or any physical process."

Apparently, Pauli [4], Misner, Thorne, & Wheeler [6], Will [7], Straumann [8], and etc. overlooked (or disagreed with) Einstein's [1, p.144] remark, "For it is clear that, e.g., the gravitational field generated by a material point in its environment certainly cannot be 'transformed away' by any choice of the system of coordinates..."

Moreover, once Pauli's version, which considers only the metric signature, is used as a "physical principle", unrestricted covariance has to be adapted; and this necessarily leads to the notion that space-time coordinates have no physical meaning. Thus, a vicious circle of logic was established within the theory. However, the price for ignoring the Einstein-Minkowski condition is often not free. For instance, Misner et al [6] and Ohanian & Ruffini [9], different from others, have made the incorrect conclusion on the local time of the earth.[1)]

If the coordinates were arbitrary, there would be no definite logical deduction in such a theory because every physical quantity has to be measurable and therefore must be expressed in terms of coordinates. Thus, in current theory, inevitably there are inconsistent results and statements that cannot be verified. An example, as shown by

Logunov and Mestvirishvili [10], that diffeomorphic coordinate systems could lead to inconsistent results (positive or negative) of gravitational radiation. Another example is that attempts to obtain a metric for uniform gravity in support of Einstein's equivalence principle had failed [11].

Moreover, the equivalence of accelerated mass and gravitational mass (weak equivalence principle or WEP for short [7]), the foundation of Einstein's equivalence principle, would have to be justified anew in terms of general relativity since the supporting experiments were not based arbitrary coordinate systems. As P. Morrison [12, 13] pointed out, the "covariance principle" disrupts the necessary physical continuity from special relativity to general relativity. Moreover, Zhou [14] pointed out, "The concept that coordinates don't matter in the interpretation of Einstein's theory ... necessarily leads to mathematical results which can hardly have a physical interpretation and are therefore a mystification of the theory." Since this problem would be applicable to almost to any issue, it was not clear that Einstein's theory is compatible with experiments.

Fortunately, it has been proven that Einstein's equivalence principle necessarily implies an existence of the Euclidean-like structure for a physical space [15, 16]. Thus, the physical meaning of space coordinates has been clarified, and the local time can be determined. In addition, it has been shown that Einstein's "principle of covariance" has no theoretical basis in physics or observational support beyond what is allowed by the principle of general relativity [12]. Moreover, a clear counter example against general covariance is given [17]. In addition, based on the Einstein-Minkowski condition, Einstein's theory of measurement is proven invalid [13]. However, this only means that some of the fundamental problems have been addressed.

Unfortunately, some misunderstanding of general relativity actually started from special relativity. Now let us examine the classic torsion-balance measurements of Eötvös, Dicke, and Braginsky and their collaborators [18, 19].

2. The Eötvös-type Experiment

For the convenience of discussion, we use the description of Will [7]. Two objects of different composition are connected by a rod of length r, and suspended in a horizon orientation by a fine wire ("torsion balance"). If the gravitational acceleration of the bodies differs, there will be a torque N induced on the suspension wire, given by

$$\mathrm{N} = \eta r(\bar{g} \times \hat{e}_w) \cdot \hat{e}_r \qquad \text{where} \qquad \eta \equiv 2\frac{|a_1 - a_2|}{|a_1 + a_2|}, \tag{1}$$

a_1 and a_2 are the accelerations of the two bodies, $\vec{g}$ is the gravitational acceleration, and e_w and e_r are unit vectors along the wire and the rod respectively. Here η is the dimensionless parameter that measures the strength of the violation of

WEP. If the entire apparatus is rotated about a direction ω with angular velocity |ω|, the torque will be modulated with a period 2π/ω. In the experiment of Barron Roland von Eötvös, g was the acceleration of the earth. In the Princeton [20] and Moscow [19] experiments, g was that of the Sun and the rotation of the earth provided the modulation N at the period of 24 hr. The modulated torque was determined either by measuring the torsional motion of the rod (Moscow) or by measuring the force required to counteract the torque and keep the rod in place (Princeton). The resulting upper limits on measurable torques |N| yielded limits on η given by

$$|\eta| < \begin{cases} 1\times 10^{-11} & [\mathrm{Pr}\,inceton] \\ 1\times 10^{-12} & [Moscow] \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

where the limits are formal standard deviations.

It should be noted that since a physical space has a frame of reference with the Euclidean-like structure, these experimental results can be directly applied to a physical space in general relativity. If the space coordinates were ambiguous as in Einstein's theory of measurement, first one has to clarify at least what acceleration means.

3. Will's Invalid Interpretation and Misunderstanding in Relativity

Will further assumed that the passive gravitational mass m_p of a body is

$$m_p = m_I + \sum_A \eta^A E^A / c^2 \tag{3}$$

where m_I is the inertial mass of the body, E^A is the internal energy of the energy of the body generated by interaction A and η^A is a dimensionless parameter the measures the strength of the violation of WEP induced by that interaction, and c is the speed of light at vacuum.

Thus, the acceleration of body 1 and 2 are respectively,

$$a_1 = \left(1 + \sum \eta^A E_1^A / m_1 c^2\right) g, \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 = \left(1 + \sum \eta^A E_2^A / m_2 c^2\right) g \tag{4}$$

where the subscript I on m_1 and m_2 have been dropped. It follows eqs. (1) and (4) that

$$\eta \equiv 2\frac{|a_1 - a_2|}{|a_1 + a_2|} = \sum_A \eta^A \left(\frac{E_1^A}{m_1 c^2} - \frac{E_2^A}{m_2 c^2}\right). \tag{5}$$

Thus, based on the experimental limits on η, Will could placed limits on the WEP-violation parameters η^A. The basis of assumption (3) seems to be the famous equation $E = mc^2$. However, to be more precise, special relativity implies only that mass and energy are equivalent in connection with energy-momentum conservation [21, 22].

Thus, assumption (3) actually has an implicit assumption, i.e., any type of energy is equivalent to mass. Unfortu-

nately, according to general relativity, this is simply not true. This is due to that the source of an Einstein equation is an energy-stress tensor [23], and thus the equivalence of energy-mass is restricted. For example, the electromagnetic energy and mass are not equivalent, since an electromagnetic stress tensor is traceless. This has been explicitly manifested by the Reissner-Nordstrom metric [23, 24],

$$ds = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{q^2}{r^2}\right)dt^2 - \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r} + \frac{q^2}{r^2}\right)^{-1} dr^2 - r^2 d\Omega^2, \tag{6}$$

where q and M are the charge and mass of a particle and r is the radial distance from the particle. Note that, in this metric, the gravitational components generated by mass and electricity have different signs and furthermore, very different radial coordinate dependence. Since not every type of energy is equivalent to mass, Will's assumption (3) is actually invalid. It is impossible to justify a violation of general relativity as a theoretical basis of general relativity.

Nevertheless, this nonequivalence remains compatible with Einstein's famous equation, relating the total energy E_T and mass M_T,

$$E_T = M_T c^2 \tag{7}$$

It is crucial to note that E_T is the *total* energy of the particle. The massive energy-stress tensor has a very specific form that not each type of internal energy is compatible with. Obviously, there are physical differences for massive and massless energy forms. Note that electromagnetic energy such as photons has no rest mass equivalence. This means that there should be cancellations among gravitational effects due to different types of energy.

Moreover, if mass-energy equivalence was assumed, Newtonian theory would imply that an electromagnetic plane wave could generate an infinitely divergent gravitational potential because the electromagnetic energy, on the average, is constant. However, the approximately validity of classical electrodynamics and special relativity requires that such a potential be not only finite but also bounded, as general relativity implies [25]. In addition, in an atom, the total energy includes at least the nuclear energy; the related electromagnetic energy is comparatively small. Thus, general relativity also requires the verified fact of a small isospin dependence of the nuclear force. A complete isospin independence of nuclear energy is not supported by nuclear physics [26].

4. Remarks

The paper points out that a direct application of well-known accurate experiments to general relativity should be addressed if the coordinates in general relativity were arbitrary as in Einstein's theory. This important issue is overlooked in many textbooks of general relativity. Moreover, it is probably useless to address this problem without solving the physical meaning of space coordinates. However, this issue must be solved because it is re-

lated to the validity of general relativity since the "covariance principle" is not generally valid. Thus, the discovery of that a physical space necessarily has a frame of reference with the Euclidean-like structure is important.

This paper points out also another fundamental error in the current theory of general relativity due to inadequate understanding of special relativity. Einstein's famous equation, $E = mc^2$, was often misunderstood as any form of energy has a related mass although Einstein [27] has made clear that such a relation must be understood in term of energy conservation. In this paper, it is shown that some type of energy such an electromagnetic energy does not have a mass. Moreover, it is illustrated that $m = Ec^{-2}$ is in fact inconsistent with Einstein's field equation in general relativity. A profound consequence is that the coupling constant of gravity needs not always the same [21]. Thus, it is possible that an anti-gravity coupling may exist as mentioned by Pauli [4].

The misinterpretation of $E = mc^2$ as any energy has a mass correspondence, i.e., $m = Ec^{-2}$ is a rather common one. For instance, Tolman [28; p. 49], Fock [29; p.111], and Hawking [30, p. 107] have also made this mistake explicitly. Will has made this mistake along with other invalid assumptions [22] [2)] in his 1976 interpretation of the Kreuzer experiment [31]. In view of that Will's book "Theory and experiment in gravitational physics" gets only positive comments from two top journals [3)4)], this error seems to have been rather universally committed. However, there are few exceptions, such as D. Bohm [32]. It is hope that this paper would call the attention to this important issue of over simplifying the relationship between mass and energy.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges stimulating discussions with Professor A. J. Coleman, and Professor C. Wong. This work is supported in part by Innotec Design, Inc., U. S. A.

ENDNOTES

1) Misner, Thorne, & Wheeler [6; p. 386] claimed that Einstein's equivalence principle is as follows: -

> "In any and every local Lorentz frame, anywhere and anytime in the universe, all the (Nongravitational) laws of physics must take on their familiar special-relativistic form. Equivalently, there is no way, by experiments confined to infinitestimally small regions of spacetime, to distinguish one local Lorentz frame in one region of spacetime frame any other local Lorentz frame in the same or any other region."

However, this is only an alternative version of Pauli's because the Einstein-Minkowski condition is ignored. In their eq. (40.14) [6; p. 1107], they got a physically incorrect conclusion on the local time of the earth in the solar

system because they did not understand Einstein's equivalence principle and related theorems in Riemannian space. Unfortunately, Ohanian & Ruffini [9; p. 198] also ignored the Einstein-Minkowski condition and had the same problems as shown in their eq. (50). However, Liu [33], Straumann [8], Wald [24], and Weinberg [23] did not make the same mistake. Note that Ohanian, Ruffini, and Wheeler became non-believer of Einstein's principles [9].

2) Will was an open referee of [22].

3) "Consolidates much of the literatures on experimental gravity and should be invaluable to researchers in gravitation."— Science on Will's book [7].

4) "A concise meaty book ... and a most useful reference work ... researchers and serious students of gravitation should be pleased with it." – Nature on Will's book [7].

REFERENCES

1. A. Einstein, H. A. Lorentz, H. Minkowski, H. Weyl, ***The Principle of Relativity*** (Dover, N. Y., 1923).
2. A. Einstein, ***The Meaning of Relativity*** (1921) (Princeton Univ. Press, 1954).
3. J. Norton, "What was Einstein's Principle of Equivalence?" in ***Einstein's Studies Vol. 1***: Einstein and the History of General Relativity, eds. D. Howard & J. Stachel (Birkhäuser, 1989).
4. W. Pauli, ***Theory of Relativity*** (Pergamon, London, 1958).
5. D. Kramer, H. Stephani, E. Herlt, & M. MacCallum, ***Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations***, ed. E. Schmutzer (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1980).
6. C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne, & J. A. Wheeler, ***Gravitation*** (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973).
7. C. M. Will, ***Theory and experiment in gravitational physics*** (Cambridge Univ. press, Cambridge, 1981).
8. N. Straumann, ***General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*** (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984).
9. H. C. Ohanian & R. Ruffini, ***Gravitation and Spacetime*** (Norton, New York, 1994).
10. A. Logunov and M. Mestvirishvili, ***The Relativistic Theory of Gravitation*** (Mir Publishers, Moscow, 1989), p. 106.
11. V. A. Fock, ***The Theory of Space Time and Gravitation*** (Pergamon Press, New York, 1964).
12. C. Y. Lo, Phys. Essays, **18** (1), (March, 2005).
13. C. Y. Lo, Phys. Essays, **18** (4), (December, 2005).
14. Zhou (Chou) Peiyuan, "On Coordinates and Coordinate Transformation in Einstein's Theory of Gravitation" in Proc. ***of the Third Marcel Grossmann Meetings on Gen. Relativ.,*** ed. Hu Ning, Science Press & North Holland. (1983), 1-20.

15. C. Y. Lo, Phys. Essays, 15 (3), 303-321 (September, 2002).

16. C. Y. Lo, Chinese J. of Phys. (Taipei), Vol. 41, No. 4, 233-343 (August 2003).

17. C. Y. Lo, Chin. Phys. (Beijing), No. 2, Vol. 13 (February 2004).

18. R. H. Dicke, Experimental relativity: In *Relativity, Groups, and Topology,* ed. C. DeWitt and B. DeWitt, pp 165-313 Gordon and Breach, New York (1964).

19. V. B. Braginsky, The detection of small accelerations, gravitational antennae, verification of the principle of equivalence. In *Experimental Gravitation: Proceedings of Course 56 of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi."* Ed. B. Bertotti, pp 235-62. Academic New York (1974).

20. P. G. Roll, R. Krotkov, R. H. Dicke (1964) The equivalence of inertial and passive gravitational mass, Ann. Phys. (N. Y.) **26**, 442-517 (1964).

21. C. Y. Lo, Phys. Essays **10** (4), 540-545 (Dec., 1997).

22. C. Y. Lo, Astrophys. J. **477,** 700-704 (March 10, 1997).

23. S. Weinberg, ***Gravitation and Cosmology*** (John Wiley Inc., New York, 1972).

24. R. M. Wald, ***General Relativity*** (The Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1984).

25. C. Y. Lo, Gravitational Waves and Modification of Einstein's Equation, in Proc. Sixth Marcel Grossmann Meeting On General Relativity, Kyoto Univ., Japan, 23-29 June 1991, Ed. H. Sato & T. Nakamura, Ser. Ed. R. Ruffini B, 1496-1498 (Singapore: World Sci., 1992).

26. J. M. Blatt and V. F. Weisskopf, Theoretical Nuclear Physics (Wiley, New York, 1952).

27. A. Einstein, '$E = mc^2$' (1946) in ***Ideas and Opinions*** (Dover, 1982).

28. R. C. Tolman, ***Relativity, Thermodynamics, and Cosmology*** (Dover, New York, 1987).

29. V. A. Fock, ***The Theory of Space Time and Gravitation***, translated by N. Kemmer (Pergamon Press, 1964).

30. S. Hawking, ***A Brief History of Time*** (Bantam Books, New York, 1988).

31. C. M. Will, Astrophysical J. 204, 224 (1976).

32. D. Bohm, Special Theory of Relativity (Taylor & Francis, Inc., New York, 1996)

33. Liu Liao, ***General Relativity*** (High Education Press, Shanghai, China, 1987), pp 13-16.

I would like to submit my paper, "Comments on Interpretations of the Eötvös Experiment and Misinterpretation of $E = mc^2$," to your journal. The copyright of this paper, if accepted, will be automatically transferred to your journal.

This paper discusses two issues: 1) apply experimental results done in a Euclidean space to general relativity; and 2) the influence of misinterpretation in special relativity to general relativity.

Thank you for your kind attention. I am looking forward to hearing from you.