

Translation into English: [Chapter 2 - Catalogue of Errors for Both Theories of Relativity](#)

from the German documentation of G.O. Mueller

"On the Absolute Magnitude of the Special Theory of Relativity - A Documentary Thought Experiment on 95 Years of Criticism (1908-2003) with Proof of 3789 Critical Works" - Text Version 2.1 - June 2004
<http://www.ekkehard-friebe.de/kap2.pdf>

Translator: Rothwell Bronrowan

© Copyright Ekkehard Friebe – Oct. 2012

E: Motion / Error No. 3

Albert Einstein maintains that the STR "is supported ... by the kinematics of the rigid body," and Max v. Laue maintains that "The assumption of a rigid body is incompatible with the [special] theory of relativity"

The contradiction between AE 1905 (p. 892) and M. v. Laue 1913 (p. 50) with respect to rigid bodies relates to a basic condition of the theory and has consequences for the alleged effects of length contraction and time dilation, for reciprocity and for the reality or apparent nature of these effects.

The contradiction between Albert Einstein and Max v. Laue has been recognized neither by the two protagonists themselves nor by subsequent relativists and has not, therefore, been resolved. This contradiction - regardless of the reader's solution and for as long as it remains unresolved by consensus in the context of discussion amongst professionals - is the cause of further contradictory deductions and is a good case in point for the assumption of a fundamental theoretical error. And until proof is given for the one or the other alternative (rigidity accepted and fundamental, or denied because incompatible), this contradiction itself is the proof of the theoretical error; it exists in the contradictory ontological status of the alleged effects.

The supposition as to the existence or non-existence of rigid bodies is only another consequence of the combination of "is" and "appears to be" for the same processes, fabricated by Albert Einstein in his document of 1905. Sometimes a length "is" contracted for Albert Einstein (p. 896: that it [the length] is different from l), and sometimes it "appears to be" contracted (p. 903: appears contracted; shrunken ... as observed from the system at rest).

M. v. Laue contests the rigid body, because this naturally creates problems for the alleged length contractions, and because he himself wants to explain contraction as real and associated with the elasticity of the body (p. 45).

Since the author of the theory did not want to decide, or couldn't decide, the successors pointedly took no notice of this contradiction, each choosing instead his own version and pretending vis-à-vis his public that it was the only possible version - which is why the world of relativity is so full of contradictory interpretations. - This virtually programmatic inconsistency in the world of relativity serves as a welcome disguise for its invalidity and for preventing effective criticism, due to a variety of shimmering presentations of the world. This fact is relatively seldom addressed by the critics because most critics naively believe that there must in the end be a physical problem that just needs to be correctly presented.

The true social security system of the world of relativity, from inconsistency and disinformation to suppression of the criticism, is only seen by a few of the critics. Critics who do recognize this social protection system of the theory, however, are particularly bitter in their comments. Examples: Gehrcke 1924, Hundert Autoren gegen Einstein [A Hundred Authors Against Einstein] 1931, Hjort 1930-1934, Soddy 1954, Barth since 1954, Rudakov 1981, Santilli 1984, Bourbaki 1990, Galeczki/Marquardt 1997.

Contradictions between the claims of authoritative relativists are the rule. They belong, so to speak, to the starter kit of the STR. - The omnipresent contradictions of the STR can be distinguished as follows:

- (1) contradictions between Albert Einstein's own claims regarding the STR;
- (2) contradictions between Albert Einstein's claims regarding the STR and the GTR;

(3) contradictions between Albert Einstein's claims and those of his representative followers, successors and interpreters;

(4) contradictions between the statements of the various relativistic interpreters.

This forest of contradictions hides not only the ruins of the theory from the eyes of the unsuspecting public, it also makes it difficult for the critics to organize public discussion on the world of relativity, because each argument of the critics can be countered by the relativists with a reference to some opposite relativistic position defended by someone, somewhere, and the someone actually does exist! What doesn't exist, however, is a non-contradicted theory.

There is, then, a wonderful haze from the multitude of contradictions, a protective shield of disinformation that forms the only provisional salvation of the theory and its supporters from public disgrace, which is why the relativists will also do nothing to free the image of their theory from its contradictions. Instead they prefer to give assurances that there are no contradictions in the theory!

AE 1905. - M. v. Laue 1913. - Rudakov, N.: Fiction stranger than truth : in the metaphysical labyrinth of relativity. Geelong, Vic., Australia: The Author [Selbstverlag], 1981. 175 S. - Santilli, Ruggero Maria: Il grande grido: Ethical probe on Einstein's followers in the U. S. A. : an insider's view; a conspiracy in the U.S. Academic-Governmental Complex on Einstein's relativities? 2nd print., November 1984. Newtonville, Mass.: Alpha Publ., 1984. 354 pages.