

# **Chapter 1**

## **E=mc<sup>2</sup> = E=m: The Constants Illusion Exposed**

Why Einstein's c-constant conceals the fundamental error  
From Dynamic Ratios to the Constants Illusion

## **Abstract**

This work reveals the central point of Einstein's relativity theory:  $E=mc^2$  is mathematically identical to  $E=m$ . The only difference lies in Einstein's treatment of  $c$  as a "constant" instead of a dynamic ratio. By fixing  $c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s}$ , the natural time-mass duality  $T \cdot m = 1$  is artificially "frozen," leading to apparent complexity. The T0 theory shows:  $c$  is not a fundamental law of nature, but only a ratio that must be variable if time is variable. Einstein's error was not  $E=mc^2$  itself, but the constant-setting of  $c$ .

# Contents

|          |  |          |
|----------|--|----------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>E=mc<sup>2</sup> = E=m: The Constants Illusion Exposed</b>  | <b>1</b> |
| 1.1      | The Central Thesis: E=mc <sup>2</sup> = E=m . . . . .          | 1        |
| 1.1.1    | The Mathematical Identity . . . . .                            | 1        |
| 1.1.2    | What is c really? . . . . .                                    | 1        |
| 1.2      | Einstein's Fundamental Error: The Constant-Setting . . . . .   | 1        |
| 1.2.1    | The Act of Constant-Setting . . . . .                          | 1        |
| 1.2.2    | The Problem of Time Variability . . . . .                      | 2        |
| 1.2.3    | The T0 Resolution . . . . .                                    | 2        |
| 1.3      | The Constants Illusion: How it Works . . . . .                 | 2        |
| 1.3.1    | The Mechanism of the Illusion . . . . .                        | 2        |
| 1.3.2    | What Really Happens (T0 View) . . . . .                        | 2        |
| 1.4      | c as Ratio vs. c as Constant . . . . .                         | 3        |
| 1.4.1    | c as Natural Ratio (T0) . . . . .                              | 3        |
| 1.4.2    | c as Artificial Constant (Einstein) . . . . .                  | 3        |
| 1.5      | The Time Dilation Paradox . . . . .                            | 3        |
| 1.5.1    | Einstein's Contradiction Exposed . . . . .                     | 3        |
| 1.5.2    | Einstein's Hidden Solution . . . . .                           | 4        |
| 1.5.3    | T0's Natural Solution . . . . .                                | 4        |
| 1.6      | The Mathematical Demonstration . . . . .                       | 4        |
| 1.6.1    | From E=mc <sup>2</sup> to E=m . . . . .                        | 4        |
| 1.6.2    | The Reverse Direction: From E=m to E=mc <sup>2</sup> . . . . . | 4        |
| 1.7      | The Arbitrariness of Constant Choice: c or Time? . . . . .     | 5        |
| 1.7.1    | Einstein's Arbitrary Decision . . . . .                        | 5        |
| 1.7.2    | Option 1: Einstein's c-constant . . . . .                      | 5        |
| 1.7.3    | Option 2: Time-constant (Einstein could have chosen) . . . . . | 5        |
| 1.7.4    | Mathematical Equivalence of Both Options . . . . .             | 6        |
| 1.7.5    | Why Einstein Chose Option 1 . . . . .                          | 6        |
| 1.7.6    | T0's Overcoming of Both Options . . . . .                      | 6        |
| 1.7.7    | Liberation from Constant Constraint . . . . .                  | 7        |
| 1.8      | The Reference Point Revolution: Earth → Sun → Nature . . . . . | 7        |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.8.1 The Reference Point Analogy: Geocentric → Heliocentric → T0 . . . . . | 7  |
| 1.8.2 Why We Need Reference Points . . . . .                                | 8  |
| 1.8.3 The Right vs. Wrong Reference Point . . . . .                         | 8  |
| 1.9 When Something Becomes "Constant" . . . . .                             | 9  |
| 1.9.1 The Fundamental Reference Point Problem . . . . .                     | 9  |
| 1.9.2 The Natural Stage: Everything is Relative . . . . .                   | 9  |
| 1.9.3 The Moment of Reference Point Setting . . . . .                       | 9  |
| 1.9.4 The Reference Point Problematic . . . . .                             | 10 |
| 1.9.5 T0's Reference Point-Free Physics . . . . .                           | 10 |
| 1.9.6 Example: The Meter Definition . . . . .                               | 10 |
| 1.9.7 The Circular Error: Humans Define Their Own "Constants" . . . . .     | 11 |
| 1.9.8 T0's Resolution of the Reference Point Illusion . . . . .             | 11 |
| 1.10 Why c-Constancy is Not Provable . . . . .                              | 11 |
| 1.10.1 The Fundamental Measurement Problem . . . . .                        | 11 |
| 1.10.2 The Gauge Definition Problem . . . . .                               | 12 |
| 1.10.3 The Systematic Compensation Problem . . . . .                        | 12 |
| 1.10.4 The Burden of Proof Problem . . . . .                                | 12 |
| 1.10.5 T0 Prediction for Precise Measurements . . . . .                     | 12 |
| 1.11 Ontological Consideration: Calculations as Constructs . . . . .        | 13 |
| 1.11.1 The Fundamental Epistemological Limit . . . . .                      | 13 |
| 1.11.2 Einstein's Construct vs. T0's Construct . . . . .                    | 13 |
| 1.11.3 The Ontological Relativity . . . . .                                 | 13 |
| 1.11.4 Why T0 is Still "Better" . . . . .                                   | 14 |
| 1.11.5 The Epistemological Humility . . . . .                               | 14 |
| 1.11.6 The Pragmatic Consequence . . . . .                                  | 15 |
| 1.11.7 The Ontological Humility . . . . .                                   | 15 |
| 1.12 The Practical Consequences . . . . .                                   | 15 |
| 1.12.1 Why $E=mc^2$ "Works" . . . . .                                       | 15 |
| 1.12.2 When $E=mc^2$ Fails . . . . .  | 16 |
| 1.12.3 T0's Universal Validity . . . . .                                    | 16 |
| 1.13 The Correction of Physics History . . . . .                            | 16 |
| 1.13.1 Einstein's True Achievement . . . . .                                | 16 |
| 1.13.2 The Historical Irony . . . . .                                       | 16 |
| 1.14 The T0 Perspective: c as Living Ratio . . . . .                        | 17 |
| 1.14.1 c as Expression of Time-Mass Duality . . . . .                       | 17 |
| 1.14.2 The Dynamic Speed of Light . . . . .                                 | 17 |
| 1.15 Experimental Tests of c-Variability . . . . .                          | 17 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.15.1 Proposed Experiments . . . . .                 | 17 |
| 1.15.2 Expected Results . . . . .                     | 18 |
| 1.16 Conclusions . . . . .                            | 18 |
| 1.16.1 The Central Recognition . . . . .              | 18 |
| 1.16.2 Physics After the Constants Illusion . . . . . | 18 |
| 1.16.3 Einstein's Corrected Legacy . . . . .          | 18 |

## 1.1 The Central Thesis: $E=mc^2 = E=m$

The Fundamental Recognition

**$E=mc^2$  and  $E=m$  are mathematically identical!**

The only difference: Einstein treats  $c$  as a "constant," although  $c$  is a dynamic ratio.

**Einstein's error:**  $c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} = \text{constant}$

**T0 truth:**  $c = L/T = \text{variable ratio}$

### 1.1.1 The Mathematical Identity

In natural units:

$$E = mc^2 = m \times c^2 = m \times 1^2 = m \quad (1.1)$$

This is not an approximation - this is exactly the same equation!

### 1.1.2 What is $c$ really?

$$c = \frac{\text{Length}}{\text{Time}} = \frac{L}{T} \quad (1.2)$$

**$c$  is a ratio, not a natural constant!**

## 1.2 Einstein's Fundamental Error: The Constant-Setting

### 1.2.1 The Act of Constant-Setting

Einstein set:  $c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} = \text{constant}$

**What does this mean?**

$$c = \frac{L}{T} = \text{constant} \Rightarrow \frac{L}{T} = \text{fixed} \quad (1.3)$$

**Implication:** If  $L$  and  $T$  can vary, their **ratio** must remain constant.

### 1.2.2 The Problem of Time Variability

**Einstein recognized himself:** Time dilates!

$$t' = \gamma t \quad (\text{time is variable}) \quad (1.4)$$

**But simultaneously he claimed:**

$$c = \frac{L}{T} = \text{constant} \quad (1.5)$$

**This is a logical contradiction!**

### 1.2.3 The T0 Resolution

**T0 insight:**  $T(x, t) \cdot m = 1$

This means:

- Time  $T(x, t)$  **must** be variable (coupled to mass)
- Therefore  $c = L/T$  **cannot** be constant
- $c$  is a **dynamic ratio**, not a constant

## 1.3 The Constants Illusion: How it Works

### 1.3.1 The Mechanism of the Illusion

**Step 1:** Einstein sets  $c = \text{constant}$

$$c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} = \text{fixed} \quad (1.6)$$

**Step 2:** Time becomes "frozen" by this

$$T = \frac{L}{c} = \frac{L}{\text{constant}} = \text{apparently determined} \quad (1.7)$$

**Step 3:** Time dilation becomes "mysterious effect"

$$t' = \gamma t \quad (\text{why?} \rightarrow \text{complicated relativity theory}) \quad (1.8)$$

### 1.3.2 What Really Happens (T0 View)

**Reality:** Time is naturally variable through  $T(x, t) \cdot m = 1$

**Einstein's constant-setting** "freezes" this natural variability artificially

**Result:** One needs complicated theory to repair the "frozen" dynamics

## 1.4 c as Ratio vs. c as Constant

### 1.4.1 c as Natural Ratio (T0)

$$c(x, t) = \frac{L(x, t)}{T(x, t)} \quad (1.9)$$

**Properties:**

- $c$  varies with location and time
- $c$  follows the time-mass duality
- No artificial constants
- Natural simplicity:  $E = m$

### 1.4.2 c as Artificial Constant (Einstein)

$$c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} = \text{constant everywhere} \quad (1.10)$$

**Problems:**

- Contradiction to time dilation
- Artificial "freezing" of time dynamics
- Complicated repair mathematics needed
- Inflated formula:  $E = mc^2$

## 1.5 The Time Dilation Paradox

### 1.5.1 Einstein's Contradiction Exposed

**Einstein claims simultaneously:**

$$c = \text{constant} \quad (1.11)$$

$$t' = \gamma t \quad (\text{time varies}) \quad (1.12)$$

**But:**

$$c = \frac{L}{T} \quad \text{and} \quad T \text{ varies} \quad \Rightarrow \quad c \text{ cannot be constant!} \quad (1.13)$$

### 1.5.2 Einstein's Hidden Solution

Einstein "solves" the contradiction through:

- Complicated Lorentz transformations
- Mathematical formalisms
- Space-time constructions
- **But the logical contradiction remains!**

### 1.5.3 T0's Natural Solution

**No contradiction in T0:**

$$T(x, t) \cdot m = 1 \Rightarrow \text{time is naturally variable} \quad (1.14)$$

$$c = \frac{L}{T} \Rightarrow c \text{ is naturally variable} \quad (1.15)$$

**No constant-setting** → **No contradictions** → **No complicated repair mathematics**

## 1.6 The Mathematical Demonstration

### 1.6.1 From $E=mc^2$ to $E=m$

**Starting equation:**  $E = mc^2$

**c in natural units:**  $c = 1$

**Substitution:**

$$E = mc^2 = m \times 1^2 = m \quad (1.16)$$

**Result:**  $E = m$

### 1.6.2 The Reverse Direction: From $E=m$ to $E=mc^2$

**Starting equation:**  $E = m$

**Artificial constant introduction:**  $c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s}$

**Inflating the equation:**

$$E = m = m \times 1 = m \times \frac{c^2}{c^2} = m \times c^2 \times \frac{1}{c^2} \quad (1.17)$$

**If one defines  $c^2$  as "conversion factor":**

$$E = mc^2 \quad (1.18)$$

**This shows:**  $E = mc^2$  is only  $E = m$  with **artificial inflation factor**  $c^2$ !

## 1.7 The Arbitrariness of Constant Choice: c or Time?

### 1.7.1 Einstein's Arbitrary Decision

The Fundamental Choice Option

One can choose what should be "constant"!

**Option 1 (Einstein's choice):**  $c = \text{constant} \rightarrow \text{time becomes variable}$

**Option 2 (alternative):**  $\text{time} = \text{constant} \rightarrow c \text{ becomes variable}$

Both describe the same physics!

### 1.7.2 Option 1: Einstein's c-constant

Einstein chose:

$$c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} = \text{constant (defined)} \quad (1.19)$$

$$t' = \gamma t \quad (\text{time becomes automatically variable}) \quad (1.20)$$

Language convention:

- "Speed of light is universally constant"
- "Time dilates in strong gravitational fields"
- "Clocks run slower at high velocities"

### 1.7.3 Option 2: Time-constant (Einstein could have chosen)

Alternative choice:

$$t = \text{constant (defined)} \quad (1.21)$$

$$c(x, t) = \frac{L(x, t)}{t} = \text{variable} \quad (1.22)$$

Alternative language convention:

- "Time flows equally everywhere"
- "Speed of light varies with location"
- "Light becomes slower in strong gravitational fields"

### 1.7.4 Mathematical Equivalence of Both Options

**Both descriptions are mathematically identical:**

| Phenomenon     | Einstein view            | Time-constant view |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Gravitation    | Time slows down          | Light slows down   |
| Velocity       | Time dilation            | c-variation        |
| GPS correction | "Clocks run differently" | "c is different"   |
| Measurements   | Same numbers             | Same numbers       |

Table 1.1: Two views, identical physics

### 1.7.5 Why Einstein Chose Option 1

**Historical reasons for Einstein's decision:**

- **Michelson-Morley:** c seemed locally constant
- **Aesthetics:** "Universal constant" sounded elegant
- **Tradition:** Newtonian constant physics
- **Conceivability:** c-constancy easier to imagine than time constancy
- **Authority effect:** Einstein's prestige fixed this choice

**But it was only a convention, not a natural law!**

### 1.7.6 T0's Overcoming of Both Options

**T0 shows:** Both choices are arbitrary!

$$T(x, t) \cdot m = 1 \quad (\text{natural duality without constant constraint}) \quad (1.23)$$

**T0 insight:**

- **Neither** c nor time are "really" constant
- **Both** are aspects of the same  $T \cdot m$  dynamics
- **Constancy** is only definition convention
- **$E = m$**  is the constant-free truth

### 1.7.7 Liberation from Constant Constraint

Instead of choosing between:

- c constant, time variable (Einstein)
- Time constant, c variable (alternative)

T0 chooses:

- Both dynamically coupled via  $T \cdot m = 1$
- No arbitrary fixations
- Natural ratios instead of artificial constants

## 1.8 The Reference Point Revolution: Earth → Sun → Nature

### 1.8.1 The Reference Point Analogy: Geocentric → Heliocentric → T0

The Reference Point Revolution: From Earth → Sun → Nature

**Geocentric (Ptolemy):** Earth at center

- Complicated epicycles needed
- Works, but artificially complicated

**Heliocentric (Copernicus):** Sun at center

- Simple ellipses
- Much more elegant and simple

**T0-centric:** Natural ratios at center

- $T(x, t) \cdot m = 1$  (natural reference point)
- Even more elegant:  $E = m$

**Einstein's c-constant corresponds to the geocentric system:**

- **Human** reference point at center (like Earth at center)
- **Complicated** mathematics needed (like epicycles)
- **Works** locally, but artificially inflated

**T0's natural ratios correspond to the heliocentric system:**

- **Natural** reference point at center (like Sun at center)
- **Simple** mathematics (like ellipses)
- **Universally valid and elegant**

### 1.8.2 Why We Need Reference Points

**Reference points are necessary and natural:**

- **For measurements:** We need standards for comparison
- **For communication:** Common basis for exchange
- **For technology:** Practical applications require units
- **For science:** Reproducible experiments need standards

The question is not **WHETHER**, but **WHICH** reference point:

| System       | Reference Point       | Complexity        | Elegance |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| Geocentric   | Earth                 | Epicycles         | Low      |
| Heliocentric | Sun                   | Ellipses          | High     |
| Einstein     | c-constant            | Relativity theory | Medium   |
| T0           | $T(x, t) \cdot m = 1$ | $E = m$           | Maximum  |

Table 1.2: Reference point systems comparison

### 1.8.3 The Right vs. Wrong Reference Point

**Einstein's error was not to choose a reference point:**

- **But to choose the wrong reference point!**

**Wrong reference point (Einstein):**  $c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} = \text{constant}$

- Based on human definition
- Leads to complicated mathematics
- Creates logical contradictions

**Right reference point (T0):**  $T(x, t) \cdot m = 1$

- Based on natural ratio
- Leads to simple mathematics:  $E = m$
- No contradictions, pure elegance

## 1.9 When Something Becomes "Constant"

### 1.9.1 The Fundamental Reference Point Problem

The Reference Point Illusion

**Something only becomes "constant" when we define a reference point!**

**Without reference point:** All ratios are relative and dynamic

**With reference point:** One ratio becomes artificially "fixed"

**Einstein's error:** He defined an absolute reference point for c

### 1.9.2 The Natural Stage: Everything is Relative

Before any reference point definition:

$$c_1 = \frac{L_1}{T_1} \quad (1.24)$$

$$c_2 = \frac{L_2}{T_2} \quad (1.25)$$

$$c_3 = \frac{L_3}{T_3} \quad (1.26)$$

$$\vdots \quad (1.27)$$

All c-values are relative to each other. None is "constant".

### 1.9.3 The Moment of Reference Point Setting

Einstein's fatal step:

"I define:  $c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s}$  = reference point" (1.28)

What happens at this moment:

- An **arbitrary reference point** is set
- All other c-values are measured relative to this
- The **dynamic ratio** becomes a "constant"
- The **natural relativity** is artificially "frozen"

### 1.9.4 The Reference Point Problematic

**Every reference point is arbitrary:**

- Why 299,792,458 m/s and not 300,000,000 m/s?
- Why in m/s and not in other units?
- Why measured on Earth and not in space?
- Why at this time and not at another?

### 1.9.5 T0's Reference Point-Free Physics

**T0 eliminates all reference points:**

$$T(x, t) \cdot m = 1 \quad (\text{universal relation without reference point}) \quad (1.29)$$

- No arbitrary fixations
- All ratios remain dynamic
- Natural relativity is preserved
- Fundamental simplicity:  $E = m$

### 1.9.6 Example: The Meter Definition

**Historical development of meter definition:**

1. **1793:** 1 meter = 1/10,000,000 of Earth meridian (Earth reference point)
2. **1889:** 1 meter = prototype meter in Paris (object reference point)
3. **1960:** 1 meter = 1,650,763.73 wavelengths of krypton-86 (atom reference point)
4. **1983:** 1 meter = distance light travels in 1/299,792,458 s (c reference point)

**What does this show?**

- Each definition is **human arbitrariness**
- The **reference point** changes with human technology
- There is **no "natural" length unit** - only human agreements
- **Humans make c "constant" by definition** - not nature!

### 1.9.7 The Circular Error: Humans Define Their Own "Constants"

In 1983 humans defined:

$$1 \text{ meter} = \frac{1}{299,792,458} \times c \times 1 \text{ second} \quad (1.30)$$

This makes  $c$  automatically "constant" - through human definition, not through natural law:

$$c = \frac{299,792,458 \text{ meters}}{1 \text{ second}} = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} \quad (1.31)$$

**Circular reasoning:** Humans define  $c$  as constant and then "measure" a constant!

Nature is not asked in this process!

### 1.9.8 T0's Resolution of the Reference Point Illusion

T0 recognizes:

- Definition  $\neq$  natural law
- Measurement reference point  $\neq$  physical constant
- Practical agreement  $\neq$  fundamental truth

T0 solution:

For measurements: Use practical reference points (1.32)

For natural laws: Use reference point-free relations (1.33)

## 1.10 Why $c$ -Constancy is Not Provable

### 1.10.1 The Fundamental Measurement Problem

To measure  $c$ , we need:

$$c = \frac{L}{T} \quad (1.34)$$

**But:** We measure L and T with the same physical processes that depend on  $c$ !

**Circular problem:**

- Light measures distances  $\rightarrow c$  determines L
- Atomic clocks use EM transitions  $\rightarrow c$  influences T
- Then we measure  $c = L/T \rightarrow$  We measure  $c$  with  $c$ !

### 1.10.2 The Gauge Definition Problem

**Since 1983:** 1 meter = distance light travels in 1/299,792,458 s

$$c = 299,792,458 \text{ m/s} \quad (\text{not measured, but defined!}) \quad (1.35)$$

**One cannot "prove" what one has defined!**

### 1.10.3 The Systematic Compensation Problem

If  $c$  varies, ALL measuring devices vary equally:

- **Laser interferometers:** use light ( $c$ -dependent)
- **Atomic clocks:** use EM transitions ( $c$ -dependent)
- **Electronics:** uses EM signals ( $c$ -dependent)

**Result:** All devices automatically compensate the  $c$ -variation!

### 1.10.4 The Burden of Proof Problem

**Scientifically correct:**

- One **cannot prove** that something is constant
- One can only show that it **appears constant within measurement precision**
- **Each new precision level** could show variation

Einstein's "c-constancy" was belief, not proof!

### 1.10.5 T0 Prediction for Precise Measurements

**T0 predicts:** At highest precision one will find:

$$c(x, t) = c_0 \left( 1 + \xi \times \frac{T(x, t)(x, t) - T(x, t)_0}{T(x, t)_0} \right) \quad (1.36)$$

with  $\xi = 1.33 \times 10^{-4}$  (T0 parameter)

**c varies tiny ( $\sim 10^{-15}$ ), but measurable in principle!**

## 1.11 Ontological Consideration: Calculations as Constructs

### 1.11.1 The Fundamental Epistemological Limit

Ontological Truth

**All calculations are human constructs!**

They can at best give a certain idea of reality.

**That calculations are internally consistent proves little about actual reality.**

**Mathematical consistency  $\neq$  ontological truth**

### 1.11.2 Einstein's Construct vs. T0's Construct

Both are human thought structures:

**Einstein's construct:**

- $E = mc^2$  (mathematically consistent)
- Relativity theory (internally coherent)
- 10 field equations (work computationally)
- **But:** Based on arbitrary c-constant setting

**T0's construct:**

- $E = m$  (mathematically simpler)
- $T \cdot m = 1$  (internally coherent)
- $\partial^2 E = 0$  (works computationally)
- **But:** Also only a human thought model

### 1.11.3 The Ontological Relativity

What is "really" real?

- **Einstein's space-time?** (construct)
- **T0's energy field?** (construct)
- **Newton's absolute time?** (construct)
- **Quantum mechanics' probabilities?** (construct)

All are human interpretive frameworks of the inaccessible reality!

#### 1.11.4 Why T0 is Still "Better"

Not because of "absolute truth," but because of:

**1. Simplicity (Occam's Razor):**

- $E = m$  is simpler than  $E = mc^2$
- One equation is simpler than 10 equations
- Fewer arbitrary assumptions

**2. Consistency:**

- No logical contradictions (like Einstein's)
- No constant arbitrariness
- Unified thought structure

**3. Predictive power:**

- Testable predictions
- Fewer free parameters
- Clearer experimental distinction

**4. Aesthetics:**

- Mathematical elegance
- Conceptual clarity
- Unity

#### 1.11.5 The Epistemological Humility

T0 does NOT claim to be "absolute truth."

T0 only says:

- "Here is a **simpler** construct"
- "With **fewer** arbitrary assumptions"
- "That is **more consistent** than Einstein's construct"
- "And makes **more testable** predictions"

But ultimately T0 also remains a human thought structure!

---

### 1.11.6 The Pragmatic Consequence

Since all theories are constructs:

Evaluation criteria are:

1. **Simplicity** (fewer assumptions)
2. **Consistency** (no contradictions)
3. **Predictive power** (testable consequences)
4. **Elegance** (aesthetic criteria)
5. **Unity** (fewer separate domains)

By all these criteria T0 is "better" than Einstein - but not "absolutely true".

### 1.11.7 The Ontological Humility

The deepest insight:

- Reality itself is inaccessible
- All theories are human constructs
- Mathematical consistency proves no ontological truth
- The best we have: Simpler, more consistent constructs

Einstein's error was not only the c-constant setting, but also the claim to absolute truth of his mathematical constructs.

T0's advantage is not absolute truth, but relative superiority as a thought model.

## 1.12 The Practical Consequences

### 1.12.1 Why $E=mc^2$ "Works"

$E=mc^2$  works because:

- It is mathematically identical to  $E = m$
- $c^2$  compensates the "frozen" time dynamics
- The T0 truth is unconsciously contained
- Local approximations usually suffice

### 1.12.2 When $E=mc^2$ Fails

The constants illusion breaks down at:

- Very precise measurements
- Extreme conditions (high energies/masses)
- Cosmological scales
- Quantum gravity

### 1.12.3 T0's Universal Validity

$E = m$  is valid everywhere and always:

- No approximations needed
- No constant assumptions
- Universal applicability
- Fundamental simplicity

## 1.13 The Correction of Physics History

### 1.13.1 Einstein's True Achievement

Einstein's actual discovery was:

$$E = m \quad (\text{in natural form}) \quad (1.37)$$

His error was:

$$E = mc^2 \quad (\text{with artificial constant inflation}) \quad (1.38)$$

### 1.13.2 The Historical Irony

#### The Great Irony

Einstein discovered the fundamental simplicity  $E = m$ ,  
but hid it behind the constants illusion  $E = mc^2$ !

The physics world celebrated the complicated form and overlooked  
the simple truth.

## 1.14 The T0 Perspective: $c$ as Living Ratio

### 1.14.1 $c$ as Expression of Time-Mass Duality

In T0 theory:

$$c(x, t) = f \left( \frac{L(x, t)}{T(x, t)(x, t)} \right) = f \left( \frac{L(x, t) \cdot m(x, t)}{1} \right) \quad (1.39)$$

since  $T(x, t) \cdot m = 1$ .

**$c$  becomes an expression of the fundamental time-mass duality!**

### 1.14.2 The Dynamic Speed of Light

T0 prediction:

$$c(x, t) = c_0 \sqrt{1 + \xi \frac{m(x, t) - m_0}{m_0}} \quad (1.40)$$

**Light moves faster in more massive regions!**

(Tiny effect, but measurable in principle)

## 1.15 Experimental Tests of $c$ -Variability

### 1.15.1 Proposed Experiments

**Test 1 - Gravitational dependence:**

- Measure  $c$  in different gravitational fields
- T0 prediction:  $c$  varies with  $\sim \xi \times \Delta\Phi_{\text{grav}}$

**Test 2 - Cosmological variation:**

- Measure  $c$  over cosmological time periods
- T0 prediction:  $c$  changes with universe expansion

**Test 3 - High-energy physics:**

- Measure  $c$  in particle accelerators at highest energies
- T0 prediction: Tiny deviations at  $E \sim \text{TeV}$

| Experiment          | Einstein (c constant)       | T0 (c variable)            |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Gravitational field | $c = 299792458 \text{ m/s}$ | $c(1 \pm 10^{-15})$        |
| Cosmological time   | $c = \text{constant}$       | $c(1 + 10^{-12} \times t)$ |
| High energy         | $c = \text{constant}$       | $c(1 + 10^{-16})$          |

Table 1.3: Predicted c-variations

### 1.15.2 Expected Results

## 1.16 Conclusions

### 1.16.1 The Central Recognition

The Fundamental Truth

$$E=mc^2 = E=m$$

Einstein's "constant"  $c$  is in truth a variable ratio.

The constant-setting was Einstein's fundamental error.

T0 corrects this error by returning to natural variability.

### 1.16.2 Physics After the Constants Illusion

The future of physics:

- No artificial constants
- Dynamic ratios everywhere
- Living, variable natural laws
- Fundamental simplicity:  $E = m$

### 1.16.3 Einstein's Corrected Legacy

**Einstein's true discovery:**  $E = m$  (energy-mass identity)

**Einstein's error:** Constant-setting of  $c$

**T0's correction:** Return to natural form  $E = m$

**Einstein was brilliant - he just stopped one step too early!**

# Bibliography

- [1] Einstein, A. (1905). *Does the inertia of a body depend upon its energy content?* Annalen der Physik, 18, 639–641.
- [2] Michelson, A. A. and Morley, E. W. (1887). *On the relative motion of the Earth and the luminiferous ether.* American Journal of Science, 34, 333–345.
- [3] Pascher, J. (2025). *Field-Theoretic Derivation of the  $\beta_T$  Parameter in Natural Units.* T0 Model Documentation.
- [4] Pascher, J. (2025). *Simplified Dirac Equation in T0 Theory.* T0 Model Documentation.
- [5] Pascher, J. (2025). *Pure Energy T0 Theory: The Ratio-Based Revolution.* T0 Model Documentation.
- [6] Planck, M. (1900). *On the theory of the energy distribution law of the normal spectrum.* Verhandlungen der Deutschen Physikalischen Gesellschaft, 2, 237–245.
- [7] Lorentz, H. A. (1904). *Electromagnetic phenomena in a system moving with any velocity smaller than that of light.* Proceedings of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 6, 809–831.
- [8] Weinberg, S. (1972). *Gravitation and Cosmology.* John Wiley & Sons.