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

M: The General Theory of Relativity / Error No. 6

Albert Einstein's claim that light is deflected by gravitational forces is said to have been confirmed by the observations of the eclipse of the sun in 1919

The British expedition of 1919 to Principe (an island off the coast of West Africa) and Sobral (Brazil) photographed the star locations close to the obscured sun. By comparison with photos taken of the same star locations without the sun, it was to be subsequently checked whether the star locations had been displaced by light deflection at the sun. In a meeting held on 6th Nov. 1919, Eddington, the leader of the expedition, announced as the result that the deflection of the rays of light previously calculated by Albert Einstein had been precisely confirmed. Since then, right up to the present day, the relativists maintain that this magnificent confirmation the GTR proves the correctness of the entire theory.

Detailed analyses of the observations of 1919, their conditions and results, and the evaluation presented by Eddington led to the following findings:

(1) G. B. Brown summed up, in the year 1956 (p. 630): "But worse ... is the tendency to ignore contrary instances. Extraordinary examples of finding what was expected are the early attempts to prove the formula for the 'bending of light' by the Sun. When the eclipse photographs were examined, some of the star images had moved t o w a r d s the Sun, the exact opposite of what was predicted, and others had moved sideways. Hardly any star image had moved radially, but only the radial components were considered; the tangential components, although of similar magnitude, were regarded as accidental errors and ignored. The mean deflections measured changed markedly during the passage of the Moon's shadow, as did the mean directions as well. Moreover, Einstein's formula for the variation of the deflection with distance from the Sun was a s s u m e d in determining the 'scale contents' of the photographic plates, from which the deflections were derived which were supposed to prove it. With the help of this procedure ... results were obtained which were held to be 'in exact accord with the requirements of Einstein's theory'. ... Nowadays it is fairly generally admitted that this prediction has not been proven."

(2) According to Collins / Pinch 1998 (Golem, 2nd ed.), as regards Eddington's results: "As we shall see, they were very inexact and some of them conflicted with others. When he chose which observations to count as data, and which to count as 'noise', that is, when he chose which to keep and which to discard, Eddington had Einstein's prediction very much in mind. Therefore Eddington could only claim to have confirmed Einstein because he used Einstein's derivation in deciding what his observations really were, while Einstein's derivations only became accepted because Eddington's observation seemed to confirm them. [...] Observation and prediction were linked in a circle of mutual confirmation ..." (p.45). They describe in detail the technical conditions under which the observations of 1919 took place and analyze the official interpretations (pp 46-52). Conclusion: the results were not obtained in the manner officially maintained, and they do not prove what they supposedly prove (pp 52- 55). H. v. Klüber (1960, Einstein's light deflection) gave a thorough, complete and critical overview of all observations of eclipses of the son carried out until 1959, with a compilation of all of the data. His findings (pp 73-75): there is a light deflection close to the sun. "But the observations are not sufficient to show decisively whether the deflection really follows the hyperbolic law predicted by the General Theory of Relativity, mainly because so far it has not been possible to obtain a satisfactory number of star-images sufficiently near to the Sun. As things are at present, most observations could be represented quite well even by straight lines (Mikhailov, 1956)."

H. v. Klüber thinks that, in view of the importance of these observations for the GTR, they should be repeated in future, though only under the condition that decisively better technical preconditions for the

mobile use of the equipment can be assured, because otherwise no significantly better photos could be expected on which to base a decision as to the true meaning of the observations.

The observations of 1919 were to be, according to Eddington (the only authoritative interpreter), already the triumph - and in 1960 H. v. Klüber sees further and significantly more precise observations as being necessary, in order to be able to first decide the issue. Even in 1980 there were still no more-precise observations known.

For the world of relativity it is as a matter of course that it hides the existence of often-devastating criticism, or simply makes it out to be unfounded, if the world of relativity cannot refute the facts of the case uncovered. - The process of proof for the relativists rests, in case of light deflection, on (1) the elimination of all obvious and clearly present, contradictory findings, and (2) the introduction of the claims of Albert Einstein under the preconditions that they will be interpreted such that it would be almost a miracle if Albert Einstein's claims were not to be confirmed by the result.

This handling of empiricism by the relativists was denounced by F. Soddy in 1954 at the Nobel-Prize Winners' Conference in Lindau (p. 17): "the attempt to verify this during a recent solar eclipse, provided the world with the most disgusting spectacle perhaps ever witnessed of the lengths to which a preconceived notion can bias what was supposed to be an impartial scientific inquiry. For Eddington, who was one of the party, and ought to have been excluded as an ardent supporter of the theory that was under examination, in his description spoke of the feeling of dismay which ran through the expedition when it appeared at one time that Einstein may be wrong! Remembering that in this particular astronomical investigation, the corrections for the normal errors of observation - due to diffraction, temperature changes, and the like - exceeded by many times the magnitude of the predicted deflection of the star's ray being looked for, one wonders exactly what this sort of 'science' is really worth."

As the summit of this type of 'science', the 'ardent supporter' Eddington was himself permitted, already in 1919, to interpret the results fully alone and decisively: This is what one calls sovereignty.

Whereas the propaganda of the relativists has drummed in the fairy-tale of triumph (e.g. P.C.W. Davies, 1977: "triumphantly verified") for 80 years now, it would be easy to describe the true process, if one were to regard those involved as somewhat stupid, as wishful thinking. Otherwise it is downright deceit. Soddy tends openly to the latter option, which, as a Nobel-Prize winner, he can afford to do.

The swindle already begins with the fact that experiments on both of the theories are conducted solely in the presence of their followers, which is why their findings can first acquire the status of being objective under the control of non-relativists. The critics thus tend, from experience, not to believe a word of the claims of a relativists with respect to his experiments, unless a critic was present and confirms the findings.

Joint Eclipse Meeting of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society : 1919, November 6 / chairman: Sir Joseph Thomson; [participants:] Crommelin, Eddington, Fowler, Lindemann, Newall, Silberstein. In: Observatory. 42. 1919, pp 389-398; 405: Eclipse photographs; reproduction of photography before p. 389 and before p. 405. summary in: Nature. London. 104. 1919, pp 361-362. - Soddy, Frederick: The wider aspects of the discovery of atomic disintegration : contrasting the experimental facts with the mathematical theories; [a revised version of the text of the lecture at the 4th Conference of the Nobel-Prize Winners in Lindau, 30.6.54]. In: Atomic digest. For the layman. London. 2. 1954, No. 3, pp 3-17. - Brown, George Burniston: Have we abandoned the physical theory of nature? In: Science progress. 44. 1956, No. 176, pp 619-634. - Klüber, H. von: The determination of Einstein's light-deflection in the gravitational field of the sun. In: Vistas in astronomy. Ed.: A. Beer. 3. 1960, pp 47-77. - Collins, Harry M.: The Golem: What You Should Know About Science / Harry Collins, Trevor Pinch. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1998. 192 pages (1st ed. 1993).