Challenging the Validity of Einstein's Cosmological Model: A Critical Examination Based on Objective Reality

Dong-Yih Bau

Department of Accounting and Information Management, Da-Yeh University, 168 University Rd., Dacun, Changhua 51591, Taiwan, R.O.C.
E-mail: bau@mail.dyu.edu.tw

July 15, 2024

Abstract How can the author assess whether Einstein, a scientific supernova on the planet, was right or wrong without fully exposing Einstein's conception of the universe compared to objective reality? G. B. Shaw once noted that only a few have shaped our understanding of the universe, including Ptolemy, Newton, and Einstein. In 1930, Shaw remarked: "Einstein has made a universe, and I can't tell you how long that will last." However, the author asserts in 2024 that Einstein's universe is fundamentally flawed. The author has debunked it using the objective reality approach that recently helped him discover two new conceptual universes: the erring universe and the whole universe.

In this paper, the author details the scientific advancements these two new universes offer compared to those of Newton and Einstein. He addresses and resolves three shortcomings in Newton's and Einstein's frameworks. The erring universe unveils the principle of cosmic structure, while the whole universe reveals the principle of cosmic design. Together, they represent the pinnacle of scientific progress, providing the ultimate frame of reference and underpinning natural laws and causal explanations in the universe.

This synthesis suggests that religion, based on the concept of a divine creator, and science, through the lens of objective reality, may differ from existing cosmological models in their joint quest to understand the universe's grand design. For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities—his eternal power and divine nature—have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse (*Romans* 1:20, *NIV*). The artificial truth of Einstein's universe seems as illusory as "The Emperor's New Clothes"—a profound misdirection that has distorted objective reality and caused incalculable harm to scientific understanding.

Keywords Cosmic design, Cosmic structure, Einstein's universe, Objective reality

1 Scientific progress

1.1 Einstein's Universe and its three defeats

Despite his brilliance, Einstein (1879–1955) remains an influential genius who created a significant gap between ideal and reality, seducing physicists into embracing falsehoods [1–3]. He articulated two distinct conceptions of the universe [1, p. 327]: (1) "the world as a unity dependent on humanity" and (2) "the world as a reality independent of the human factor." Regrettably, throughout his life, Einstein constructed his interpretation of the universe based on the first conception, relying on theoretical physics rather than an objective reality approach.

Einstein's universe encompasses three principal physical theories: the theory of relativity, cosmology, and unified field theory [1–3]. Today's physicists in these fields zealously perpetuate Einstein's theories, causing the herding effect. The ΛCDM model is a case in point [4]. This paper focuses on Einstein's universe [1–3] rather than the development of cosmological models motivated by it over the last 100 years [4].

Einstein first gained prominence after Eddington confirmed the general theory of relativity in 1919 by observing the bending of light during a solar eclipse on the West African island of Principe [3]. Einstein touted the theory's logical completeness, suggesting that modifying it without dismantling the entire structure would be nearly impossible [1–2]. Consequently, challenging Einstein's universe, including the theory of relativity, appears exceedingly tricky. However, as theoretical physics continued to develop increasingly detached theories from objective reality, the overpraised Einstein and his universe could ultimately be refuted solely through an objective reality approach.

In 2024, the author (1955–) identifies three significant flaws in Einstein's conceptualization of the universe:

(1) Einstein mistakenly applied the general theory of relativity to cosmology, which concerns the entirety of the universe.

(2) Einstein unfairly attributed three flaws to Newton's universe based on his theory of relativity without understanding the broader universe that reveals critical aspects of objective reality.

(3) Einstein unsuccessfully attempted to extend his theoretical physics and unified field theory rather than adopting an approach based on objective reality.

1.2 The objective reality and two universes

In 1930, Einstein reflected on *Religion and Science,* expressing his desire "to experience the universe as a single significant whole. [2, p. 38]" In 1931, he articulated this view further in his credo, *The World as I See It*, stating, "I am satisfied with the mystery of the eternity of life and with the awareness and a glimpse of the marvelous structure of the existing world, together with the devoted striving to comprehend a portion, be it ever so tiny, of the Reason that manifests itself in nature. [2, p. 11]"

As a free individual who has admired objective reality and sought to uncover the laws of nature since childhood, the author first encountered cosmic structure and design principles in 2016. These principles, revealing the intricacies of objective reality, have since been illustrated by two new universes—the erring universe and the whole universe—in which we all live, though only as parts of them. Inspired by Einstein, the erring universe and the whole universe are discoverable on Earth.

The erring universe and the whole universe are the most important scientific discoveries of the author's life, revealing the true, translucent nature of the universe. More remarkably, these two new universes starkly expose the inaccuracies in Einstein's universe, which is the focus of the author's current work. One can explore his eighteen papers stored in the e-print archive viXra (https:/vixra.org/author/dong-yih_bau), a supplementary reading for his current research. These papers document his enthusiastic efforts as a free individual striving to grasp objective reality. Now, he believes he has succeeded.

The author thoroughly analyzes four universes from three perspectives:

(1) The nature of the universe (theoretical physics versus the objective reality approach).
(2) The focus of science (the frame of reference, relativity, and the laws of nature, causality, or natural processes).
(3) Mathematics (differential laws versus integral laws).

2 Newton's Universe

2.1 The frame of reference

Einstein believed Newton's universe represented the first self-contained system of physical causality [2]. In Newton's universe, the frame of reference consists of absolute space and time.

2.2 The laws of nature

Three fundamental laws and Newton's law of gravitational force underpin the mechanics of celestial bodies. These laws are as follows [2, pp. 299–300]:

1. Law of Inertia: An object at rest will stay at rest, and an object in motion will continue to move at a constant speed in a straight line unless an external force acts upon it.
2. Law of Motion: The force acting on an object equals its mass times its acceleration.
3. Law of Force: This law describes the dependencies between two interacting bodies.

Furthermore, Newton's law of gravitation posits that the gravitational force between two masses is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them.

3 Einstein's Universe

3.1 The frame of reference

The special principle of relativity states that the laws of nature maintain consistent form across all inertial systems in uniform translatory motion relative to each other [2]. The general principle of relativity extends this concept to include non-uniform motion [2]. Additionally, the principle of the constant velocity of light in space asserts that light travels through space at a fixed speed, denoted as c [2].

3.2 The laws of nature

The special theory of relativity encompasses the special principle of relativity and the principle of the constant velocity of light in space. These principles imply that time and space are covariant under Lorentz transformations [2]. Moving from the equivalence principle of gravity and acceleration, we arrive at the general theory of relativity, a novel field theory of gravity incorporating dynamics. According to this theory, gravity emerges from the curvature of spacetime [2].

3.3 Cosmological considerations

In Einstein's 1917 paper [5], which established him as the founder of modern cosmology, Einstein first applied the general theory of relativity to cosmological questions, thus placing cosmological speculation on a solid foundation that captivated the public. Here are the key concepts he introduced [3, pp. 252–255]:

1. Space has no borders because gravity curves it back onto itself.
2. Asking what exists outside this curved universe lacks significance.
3. A static universe is untenable because gravitational forces would inevitably pull all celestial bodies together.
4. To prevent the universe from collapsing under these forces, Einstein introduced a "repulsive" force, represented by the Greek letter lambda (Λ), to create a stable, static universe.
5. He named this addition the "cosmological constant." Later, upon recognizing that the universe was expanding, Einstein referred to this as his "biggest blunder."

3.4 Three defects in Newton's Universe

In 1927, Einstein pointed out three fundamental flaws in Newton's conception of the universe [2, p. 258]: First, Newton introduced the concepts of absolute space and time, which lack physical reality. Second, he described forces acting directly and instantaneously at a distance, such as those representing the effects of gravity, which are either incorrect or unconventional. Third, Newton's theory does not account for the remarkable observation that the same factor—its mass determines a body's weight and inertia.

3.5 Theoretical physics and unified field theory

According to Einstein, "[Theoretical] physics constitutes a logical system of thought which is in a state of evolution, whose basis cannot be distilled, as it were, from experience by an inductive method, but can only be arrived at by free invention. The justification (truth content) of the system rests in the verification of the derived propositions by sense experiences, whereby the relations of the latter to the former can only be comprehended intuitively. Evolution is proceeding in the direction of increasing simplicity of the logical basis [2, p. 322].

"The sense-experiences are the given subject-matter. But the theory that shall interpret them is man-made. It is the result of an extremely laborious process of adaptation: hypothetical, never completely final, always subject to question and doubt. [2, pp. 323–324]"

There is a pressing need to clarify and correct the foundations of all physics [1–3]. All theoretical systems must adapt to merge into a unified theory. In 1923, Einstein expressed his passion for finding a unified field theory that would reconcile general relativity with electromagnetic theory and potentially encompass quantum mechanics [1–3]. He believed that both field theories should align with a unified space structure. Since 1923, Einstein diligently worked on the unified field theory, continuously revising its form until the end of his life in 1955, ultimately without success [1–3].

4 The erring universe

4.1 The laws of nature

Now, the author turns to objective reality, precisely the principle of cosmic structure. We recognize this principle through Einstein's appreciation for the marvelous structure of the universe. However, Einstein's concept of the universe focuses on spacetime structure rather than the part-whole structure. The universe possesses part-whole structures that fulfill the need for causal explanations. The author highlights the principle of cosmic structure to draw the scientific community's attention.

The erring universe exemplifies the principle of cosmic structure. The realm of our daily experiences extends universally without exception, demonstrating that we inhabit an erring universe. In this universe, success and failure intertwine. The term "success/failure system" describes systems or objects that, over time, may either thrive and succeed or deteriorate and fail. These systems encompass the panorama of life and artifacts. A planet's biosphere is its most extensive success/failure system. The existence or absence of extra-terrestrials does not challenge the reality of the erring universe.

The principle of cosmic structure encompasses the part-whole relation. In the erring universe, we observe that "A part succeeds," "A part fails," "The whole succeeds," and “The whole fails.” If the whole depends on a part for its conditions for success, then it similarly relies on that part for its causes of failure, and vice versa. The author has identified two dependency relations concerning conditions for success and causes of failure within the part-whole relationship. Consequently, he is skeptical about empirical physicists’ ability to collect data on a universal scale and about theoretical physicists’ ability to use this data to elucidate these two dependency relations.

The principle of cosmic structure also involves the part-whole structure itself. To comprehend the complexities of sensory experiences and the interconnections of sense impressions in their totality, we must apply the part-whole relation as a one-to-many relationship. We also recognize a succession of part-whole relations, forming a partial ordering (PO) structure. In the erring universe, the dependency relations for conditions for success exhibit reflexivity, anti-symmetry, and transitivity, as do the relations for causes of failure. We can mathematically formulate the success/failure system principle as follows:

$\mathrm{PO}_{\text{conditions for success}} = \mathrm{PO}_{\text{causes of failure}}$ where PO denotes partial ordering.

Many diverse success/failure systems continuously interact on Earth in the erring universe. This interaction means some succeed within and among these systems, while others fail. As natural law, the success/failure system principle makes us understand that our biosphere is a homo-ecosystem structured in three levels: inanimate matter, non-human life, and human life. These layers are interdependent, with the uppermost human layer relying on the lower layers for success or failure. Considering the current impacts of human activities on the environment, humans’ ecosystem destruction represents a failure resulting from inter-system interactions between humans and the ecosystem rather than an intra-system dependency within the homo-ecosystem. Given the complexity of Earth in the erring universe, the success/failure system principle clearly shows that maintaining and sustaining the homo-ecosystem is a responsibility humanity must embrace.

4.2 The frame of reference

The erring universe does not reveal a frame of reference. In developing the erring universe, the frame of reference appears less crucial than in Newton’s and Einstein’s universes, which focus on the movements of celestial bodies in the universe. We might refer to this concept as the moving universe.

4.3 Implications for Newton's Universe

The principle of cosmic structure, an aspect of objective reality, addresses complexity. We expect to observe cosmic structures both in the moving universe and the erring universe. For instance, Earth's orbit around the sun exemplifies a part-whole relation connected by gravitation. Similarly, all planets, including Earth, orbit the sun, demonstrating a one-to-many relation. The solar and other systems orbit the Milky Way galaxy, indicating a succession of part-whole relations. The Milky Way galaxy is on a collision course with the Andromeda galaxy, a nearby celestial system, which will occur in about 4.5 billion years, representing an inter-system interaction. It would benefit empirical physicists to explore such cosmic structures in greater detail.

Once we understand objective reality in the moving universe, let us examine how Newton's universe aligns with this aspect. Newton's law of gravitation describes only a part-whole relation with a gravitational dependency between two bodies, lacking any broader part-whole structure. Consequently, Newton's universe does not anticipate inter-system interactions. Considering the importance of the principle of cosmic structure in objective reality, it would be advantageous to move beyond the law of inertia, the first fundamental law in Newton's universe.

A common perception of Newton's universe suggests that every celestial body exerts a gravitational pull on every other body [6, p. 20]. Given this, how can Newton's law of gravitation isolate just two bodies when expressing the law, independent of all others? Another standard view is that gravity encompasses all celestial bodies together [5]. If so, how can Newton's law of gravitation extend to calculate the gravity among many bodies? In a genuinely expansive moving universe, the notion that gravity lacks structure is realistically incomplete and overly imaginative.

4.4 Implications for Einstein's Universe

The author has applied the concept of the erring universe to construct a more complex objective reality in the moving universe, building on the foundation of Newton's universe. While Einstein's general relativity extends Newton's gravitational principles to create an incomplete moving universe reliant on human perspectives, the implications of the erring universe also apply to Einstein's model, demonstrating an essential part-whole relationship in the moving universe. Theoretically, Einstein's theory of relativity introduces two significant challenges: complexities in relativity and its mathematical framework, which unnecessarily obstruct our understanding of objective reality.

Whenever the author studies the theory of relativity [1–3], he acknowledges its intellectual depth. However, contrary to common perception [3], Einstein's ability to discern the underlying physical principles does not manifest in his universe. The general theory of relativity provides an alternative to the part-whole relationship in the moving universe previously identified by Newton without engaging with the principle of cosmic structure or introducing new laws. Moreover, the notion that gravity results from the curvature of spacetime erroneously conflates causality with relativity—specifically, gravity with acceleration.

From a mathematical standpoint, the general theory of relativity uses partial differential equations and metric tensors to focus on instantaneous events [2]. Einstein held that differential laws are the only form that satisfies the modern physicist's criteria for causality, positioning them as essential tools for a new foundation in physics [2, p. 255]. In contrast, Kepler's integral laws, which view motion in a whole, fail to fulfill these criteria for causality [2]. According to the principle of cosmic structure, discrete mathematics or more straightforward mathematical formulas should describe the universe's causality. Differential laws for understanding objective reality on a cosmic scale introduce unnecessary intellectual challenges. Our observation of objective reality extends beyond what differential laws alone can express.

5 The whole universe

5.1 The laws of nature

Another facet of objective reality is the principle of cosmic design, which outlines a plan illustrating the workings and appearance of the universe. The author's research on the erring universe has identified two fundamental physical realities, mass (m) and energy (E), as the foundation for understanding this aspect of objective reality. The entire universe validates the principle of cosmic design. He will first discuss how Newton might have imaginatively approached this aspect of objective reality. Next, he will examine how Einstein interpreted $E = mc^2$ within the framework of theoretical physics. Finally, he will reveal the principle of cosmic design through the entire universe before defining "the objective reality" and elucidating the meanings of "predetermined" and "strict causality."

In 1687, Newton conceptualized his mechanical universe with his law of gravitation. Imagine if Newton had approached the entire universe instead. In this scenario, a role similar to Tycho's, who meticulously collected data on masses and energies and their interactions within the solar system, would be necessary. Then, a role akin to Kepler's would emerge, analyzing this data to eventually discover $E = mc^2$ as the empirical law of the solar system. We honor Kepler for his era's uncertain reign of law in nature [2]. Finally, the esteemed scientist Newton would have recognized $E = mc^2$ as the empirical law of the universe, adopting the objective reality approach, as he famously declared "I frame no hypotheses," (as quoted by Einstein [2, p. 273]).

In 1905, Einstein derived from the special theory of relativity the well-known equation $E = mc^2$ [2]. However, theoretical physics often views $E = mc^2$ as creations of thought rather than tangible realities [2, p. 270]. A crucial outcome of the special theory is the understanding that inert mass is essentially latent energy [2, p. 230]. The most significant conclusion is the equivalence of mass and energy, encapsulated by the celebrated equation, $E = mc^2$ [2, p. 217]. Setting aside all possible interpretations of $E = mc^2$ found in the literature, the author will demonstrate how he transforms these theoretical constructs into tangible realities, thus dramatically unveiling the principle of cosmic design. Consequently, the value of Einstein's universe serves merely (but significantly) as a stepping stone to objective reality.

In 2024, the author begins to elucidate the principle of cosmic design through the entire universe. He views mass (m) and energy (E) not as Einstein's theoretical simplifications but as two categories of fundamental physical realities on Earth. Furthermore, he perceives $E = mc^2$ as a transformation dependency between mass and energy, akin to Newton's gravitational dependency, rather than as Einstein's equivalence of mass and energy. This transformation dependency (and α, representing the totality of existence) encompasses all entities and events in the universe, reinforcing our confidence that what we observe on Earth mirrors what we observe throughout the universe. Thus, we formulate the universal law of nature as $E = mc^2$.

The intense debates between Bohr and Einstein during the 1920s to 1950s touched the core of the cosmos' design [3, pp. 325–326]. Using the principle of cosmic design, the author addresses three pertinent questions: Is there an objective reality existing independently of our observations [3]? Here, the universe reveals the principle of cosmic design, a key component of objective reality. Are there laws that enforce strict causality in the universe [3]? Although we cannot detail every interaction between mass and energy, $E=mc^2$ imposes a strict transformation dependency within humanity's scientific capability. Is everything in the universe predetermined [3]? In this context, nature uses $E = mc^2$ (and α, representing the totality of existence) to govern the workings of the entire universe. As $E = mc^2$ wields the power to affect everything, this law acts as an almighty law and an omnipotent cause. What a magnificent realization this is!

5.2 The frame of reference

The universe's appearance encompasses its shape, size, and motion. Observing Earth's spherical shape, the author infers that the universe shares this shape. In his observations, the author proposes that the universe is in perpetual oscillation to grasp the magnificence of every occurrence within the universe. The totality of mass and energy, denoted by α, continuously distributes, redistributes, and transforms throughout time and space in this oscillating universe. This totality of existence, α, employs mass and energy to create, protect, destroy, and recreate everything across time and space. It determines the smallest and largest volumes of the oscillating universe—the larger the value of α, the greater these volumes. Consequently, the entire universe, the actual universe, oscillates between these volumes.

The author now concludes his exploration of the principle of cosmic design throughout the entire universe. He has established a foundation for the principle of cosmic design using mass (m) and energy (E), unveiled the transformation dependency ($E = mc^2$) to elucidate the universe's workings, and ultimately utilized the totality of mass and energy (α) to define the universe's appearance. The author terms $E = mc^2$ as the principle of everything and α as the principle of cosmic inertia. Therefore, the principle of cosmic design, also known as the principle of everything and cosmic inertia, can be formulated as follows:

$E = mc^2$ and the natural constant α expresses the totality of mass and energy.

With an almighty law and an omnipotent cause, the whole universe serves as the ultimate frame of reference and forms the basis for all causal explanations within the universe.

One important observation: adopting an objective reality approach reveals that the universe functions as a single system or unified design. This realization suggests that all scientific endeavors, whether theoretical or empirical physics, that strive to define the actual universe will ultimately fail. We can subsequently discredit any established theory that contradicts the whole universe. For instance, applying the second law of thermodynamics leads to an incorrect conclusion about the universe's fate, such as heat death or the Big Freeze. Consequently, the hypothesis that a perpetual motion machine cannot exist [2], a cornerstone of thermodynamics, would undoubtedly be proven false.

The objective approach to understanding the whole universe and the erring universe supports all branches of science, including theoretical and empirical physics.

5.3 Implications for Newton's Universe

The author has discovered that Newton identified an incomplete moving universe and had no opportunity to explore the entire universe. However, Newton knew that his universe was not the final model, which has consistently earned Einstein's profound admiration [2]. With a deeper understanding of the universe, the author can better explain Newton's laws of nature and his frame of reference, thereby demonstrating the superiority of the principle of cosmic design.

Newton once stated, "Gravity explains the motions of the planets, but it cannot explain who sets the celestial bodies in motion. (https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Isaac_Newton)" He also remarked that an agent acting constantly according to certain laws must cause gravity. Regarding this, the principle of cosmic design, as revealed by the whole universe, initiates the motion of celestial bodies. Thus, the principle of cosmic design is an almighty law and an omnipotent cause. The principle of cosmic structure is subordinate to and driven by the principle of cosmic design. As celestial bodies in the moving universe undergo creation, preservation, and destruction, the part-whole structures exist, albeit varying locally and transiently. In summary, the principle of cosmic inertia supersedes the law of inertia and complements the law of gravity.

As the principle of cosmic design provides the causal explanation for gravity and its structure, the universe acts as the ultimate frame of reference, replacing the outdated concepts of absolute space and time. It is evident in the framework of the whole universe that all celestial bodies in the currently expanding universe are grouped into moving part-whole structures, subtly interconnected by gravitational forces and accompanying the expansion. The frame of reference is the expanding universe itself. The key concept here is neither absolute nor relative but "accompany," which embraces simultaneity. With the universe as the ultimate frame of reference, all complexities related to relativity, absolute space, time, and even human observational frameworks vanish in objective reality.

5.4 Implications for Einstein's Universe

5.4.1 Einstein's cosmological considerations

The author has also come to understand that Einstein had the opportunity to uncover the entire universe, the objective reality, through his equation $E = mc^2$. However, he pursued theoretical physics and ultimately failed to discover it. The objective reality approach strives to reveal the actual universe confidently with order and detail. To illustrate the superiority of the objective reality approach in science, the author refers to a historical event often proclaimed by C. P. Snow as the most profound intellectual debate in the history of human thought within science [3, pp. 325–326]: the dialogue between Bohr and Einstein about the fundamental heart of the cosmos' design. This debate occurred even though neither Bohr, Einstein, or anyone before them knew about objective reality on a universal scale. The author continues challenging the validity of Einstein's universe when confronted with objective reality.

The flaws of the theory of relativity are apparent, as the author has previously discussed. However, Eddington's one-time validation of the general theory of relativity in 1919 dramatically altered the course of Einstein's universe [3]. From 1919 to 1925, many prominent scientists began authoring books explaining the theory, resulting in over six hundred books and articles on relativity published following the eclipse observations [3]. This publication surge meant all contemporary scientists endorsed the theory, yielding to Einstein's authority. In *Ideas and Opinions,* about one hundred and twenty individuals appraised Einstein, with all but Lenard praising him. Lenard's critique included descriptions [1, p. 516] such as "the fate of creations alien to nature," "lacking any basis in reality," and "a striking lack of any comprehension of truth." Despite this, the scientific community still considered the theory a revolutionary way to perceive reality. Moreover, Einstein often misled the scientific community with hints that he had grasped objective reality, revealing a disconnect between his ideals and reality [1–3].

One can use general relativity to calculate the gravitational field of a celestial body, although it seems odd that a celestial body warps space. However, one cannot apply general relativity to the universe, which consists of myriad celestial bodies [5]. Otherwise, this application results in a distorted, inaccurate universe, as depicted in

Einstein's cosmological considerations [3]. The concept of an unreal spacetime continuum, instead of $E = mc^2$, fails to represent the almighty physical reality or the workings of the universe. Today, physicists in relativity and cosmology continue to delve deeper into the universe using Einstein's sophisticated theoretical tools. We now face many fictitious concepts of warped spacetimes and countless other fabrications.

5.4.2 The three defects in Newton's Universe

Einstein identified three defects in Newton's universe to demonstrate that his universe approximates objective reality—representing the actual universe—more closely than Newton's. He pointed out the first defect by invoking Mach's principle [2–3], which suggests that phenomena attributed to absolute space and time, such as inertia and centrifugal forces, arise from matter's distribution in the universe. Einstein believed that the general theory of relativity should incorporate Mach's principle as a cornerstone. However, it ultimately failed to satisfy Mach's principle. Attempts to extend Einstein's universe to formulate or explain Mach's principle also result in inaccuracies.

In response to Mach's radical idea, only the concept of the whole universe can adequately demonstrate Mach's principle. For example, the famous experiment of Newton's bucket [3], or a rotating water vessel [2], is a dramatic test of Mach's principle. The centrifugal forces in the spinning water, akin to gravitational forces, result from the influence of the entire universe. Similarly, just as the moving universe accompanies the current expansion of the universe, the spinning water temporarily aligns with this expansion. Newton's bucket remains a contentious issue, but the whole universe, as a significant facet of objective reality, can resolve these disputes.

The second defect of Newton's universe concerns the violation of the principle that no force, including gravity, can propagate faster than the speed of light, which is considered the limiting velocity for causality. This defect is untrue. We have observed that Newton's bucket's centrifugal forces appear instantaneous. If quantum entanglement is instantaneous, then this is also true for it. It is incorrect to assume that the separability principle holds that two spatially separated systems have independent existences [3]. Similarly, the principle of locality may be false: only its immediate surroundings directly influence an object [3].

The third defect in Newton's universe is disregarding the equality between inertial and gravitational mass, which also does not align with physical reality and results in confusion. However, it is significant that the principle of everything and the principle of cosmic inertia, both referring to the whole universe, demonstrate the equality of cause and relativity. In the whole universe—the actual universe—there is no confusion between cause and relativity.

5.4.3 Theoretical physics and the unified theory

Despite Einstein's pursuit of objective reality, he opted for theoretical physics, his only apparent choice [1–3]. Influenced by Einstein's aspirations [1–3], the author has unveiled two aspects of objective reality: the principle of cosmic structure as revealed by the erring universe and the principle of cosmic design as exposed by the whole universe. Einstein believed that pure thought could capture reality [2, p. 274]. If so, why did Einstein and his followers in theoretical physics fail to deduce these two aspects of objective reality? Theoretical physics has three significant drawbacks: First, it needs a more precise subject matter like the empirical universe. Second, it encourages physicists to generate grand scientific models rather than guiding them toward objective reality. Third, theoretical physics is an endless endeavor, always open to questioning and doubt. These three factors collectively promote "academic freedom."

Einstein had a strong motive for aspiring to the objective reality. $E = mc^2$ highlights a stark contrast between theoretical physics and the objective reality approach. While the former pursues elusive interpretations of the formula, the latter seeks its meanings within objective reality. Specifically, $E = mc^2$ functions as an almighty law and an omnipotent cause observable on Earth. The 1919 validation of the theory of relativity by Eddington did not confirm the accuracy of Einstein's universe. The relationship between theoretical and empirical physics is not as robust as expected. The objective reality approach dictates that the empirical world should not just offer limited phenomenological validations for cosmological models but must have the ultimate authority over objective reality. Therefore, overcoming the dichotomy between empiricism and rationalism or directly reconciling induction with deduction is essential to grasping objective reality.

The current consensus in theoretical physics includes the unified field theory, making Einstein the founder of this unified approach. Isaacson succinctly summarized Einstein's pursuit of the unified field theory [3, p. 468]. Cosmic riddles baffled Einstein. His quest lacked physical insights. It involved extensive mathematical formulations. However, the author has seen no natural foundations in all of physics. However, the whole universe has revealed to us a newer and more accurate foundation for all physics, encompassing energy (E), mass (m), $E = mc^2$, cosmic inertia (α), and an oscillating universe. Given that the whole universe with a unified design causes everything, why do physicists feel compelled to pursue unification? They have been producing extravagant theories without grounding them in observable realities.

6 Conclusions

As a child, the author learned that physics, including Einstein's universe, deserves reverence due to its alignment with the objective reality approach. During his university education in physics, he studied Einstein's theory of relativity. Twenty-one years ago, in 2003, a colleague asked him why Einstein was considered more intelligent than an ape. This question spurred him to place Einstein within the intellectual edifices of humanity. Eventually, it made him struggle to understand the objective reality approach to Einstein's universe. To his disappointment and surprise, the author discovered that Einstein devoted his talents to theoretical physics rather than an objective reality approach [1–3]. What, then, is the actual universe? In such moments of revelation, the right person must step forward.

Additionally, as a child, the author learned from Western religious traditions that God had created the universe. Einstein famously stated, "I want to know how God created this world… I want to know his thoughts. The rest are details. [1, p. 324]" From this, the author learned about the Creator's design for the workings and appearance of the universe, which constitutes a significant aspect of objective reality. He analyzed the whole universe to reveal the principle of cosmic design. He views mass (m) and energy (E) as two fundamental physical realities and perceives $E = mc^2$ as a transformation dependency between mass and energy. While we may not grasp how the Creator arranged mass and energy interactions, $E = mc^2$ demonstrates the universe's workings within the limits of humanity's scientific ability and stands as an almighty law and an omnipotent cause. Thus, religion (based on God) and science (guided by the objective reality approach) are not as irreconcilable as they seem and should foster a more profound relationship for humanity's greater good than ever. The universe's appearance includes an oscillating universe, whose totality of mass and energy (α) determines its dimensions.

Another aspect of objective reality the author encountered is the principle of cosmic structure, revealed by the erring universe—in which we all live. The whole universe and the erring universe represent the latest scientific progress on Earth. Contrary to what one might expect, no one has established the objective laws of nature on the scale of the universe except for the erring universe and the whole universe.

Regarding the erring and whole universe, Newton’s universe provides an incomplete description of the moving universe, focusing only on the gravitational dependency between two celestial bodies without exposing the cosmic structure. Einstein’s universe comprises three principal theories: the theory of relativity, cosmology, and the unified field theory. The author highlights three fallacies in Einstein’s universe. First, warped spacetime does not exist in the actual universe. Second, unification does not align with objective reality. Third, theoretical physics encourages physicists to develop their superior intellectual powers rather than experience objective reality humbly. Overall, physicists have been captivated by the enticing myth of “the world as a unity dependent on humanity.” Therefore, the author asserts that Einstein’s universe is fundamentally flawed.

Einstein, a paramount icon of science, is no mysterious figure but a scientific provocateur, not a creator. His universe has plunged science into chaos and unchecked freedom for about a century, and absurdly, no one has thoroughly discredited it. Physics concerning the universe has become mundane! The illusion of humanity’s central significance in science is untenable, as is humans’ dominion over Earth. The author’s current work investigates why physicists have likely failed in relativity, cosmology, and unified theory, such as quantum gravity, string theory, and other areas influenced by Einstein’s universe. It also provides a scientific rationale for why Einstein did not receive the Nobel Prize for the general theory of relativity in 1921 [3]. Science remains in its infancy. While Einstein’s cosmological model serves as a stepping stone toward the objective reality approach, rescuing science (inspired by him) is still nascent, with many truths yet to be uncovered. Thank you, Lord.

References

1 Calaprice, A. The Ultimate Quotable Einstein. Princeton Univ. Press (2010).

2 Einstein, A. Ideas and Opinions. Bonanza Books: (1954).

3 Isaacson, W. Einstein: His Life and Universe Simon & Schuster: (2007).

4 Debono, I.; Smoot, G.F. General Relativity and Cosmology: Unsolved Questions and Future Directions. *Universe* **2016**, *2*, 23. https://doi.org/10.3390/universe2040023

5 Einstein A. Cosmological Considerations in the General Theory of Relativity. *CAPE* **1917**, *6*, 43.

6 Feynman, R. The Character of Physical Law. MIT Press: (1992).