

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 © Ekkehard Friebe – Oct. 2012

S: Presentations / Error No. 1

The authors of relativity contradict each other in significant points, though they carefully refrain from engaging in the otherwise standard discussion in search of clarification

The significant points on which the authors of the world of relativity contradict each other are addressed in several errors, e.g. Error E 3 (rigid or non-rigid bodies), Error P 4 (appearance or reality of the effects), and Error N 1 (thermodynamics).

- Here we concentrate on the thematic width of the contradictions between the accounts of various authors and on the completely unusual approach of the relativists in handling these, their own matters. They are, namely, absolutely discreet, as though no contradictions existed. It is the same behaviour as practiced with the criticism, in keeping with the principle: what is not discussed does not exist.

Normally, for example in the case of Error E 3 (according to Albert Einstein, 1905, the STR is based on rigid bodies, while according to Max v. Laue the assumption of rigid bodies is incompatible with the STR, and this contradiction dates back to v. Laue's 2nd edition in 1913), which relates to no small issue, after all, the question of rigid bodies would be taken up in journal articles and independent treatises. The various authors would take sides, for one of two standpoints, each side would discuss the consequences of accepting the other opinion and would attempt to refute it, so that in the end at least a clear majority opinion and a minority viewpoint would emerge, or even, in the ideal case, a new consensus.

In the case in point nothing of the sort has taken place since 1913. The authors of the world of relativity appear not to recognize this fundamental contradiction (what would be an STR without rigid bodies? And how is it to be constructed without them?) or do not want to take notice of it. It is simply missing in their presentations. For this reason too the wide specialist public, and the minor masters and the non-specialist public have, one way or another, no chance of knowing better, thanks to the missing detailed knowledge. As a consequence, they cannot know why v. Laue, a true follower of Albert Einstein right from the start, writes such an astonishingly crass contradiction in his monograph: v. Laue repeatedly bases his arguments on the elasticity of the body, not least in order to explain length contraction, which could not be attributed to an assumed rigid body. Anyone who broaches the issue of this fundamental contradiction between Albert Einstein and Max v. Laue would be unable to avoid a discussion on the question as to the cause of the effects. He would soon find himself at the heart of the problem zone of the theory, would be confronted with the contradictions and would have to take a position.

The whole thematic width of the contradictions can be seen by any reader who takes an objective look at more than two presentations of the theory. The contradictions also arise in the passages of the presentations, where the authors merely recount Albert Einstein's experiences with railway carriages. Causes are partly the inability to report things correctly, but also partly the efforts made to correct the defects or errors discovered in the railway stories and thereby to improve the theory. In this way a patchwork carpet of variants and versions emerges as decisive specialist literature, and - wonder of wonders! - not a single relativist appears to have noticed this patchwork carpet, to say nothing whatsoever of the science historians, because they never allow any non-devout ideas anyway, if they want to be invited in future to Einstein archives, symposiums and relativity congresses (which for them would otherwise effectively amount to exclusion from the profession in the field of theoretical physics). Even the investigative and so critical scientific journalism has never found anything, but prefers to report on confidential fireside discussions with the great luminaries and their grand views of the future.

The neglect of even the necessary internal discussion for clarification amounts to a hindrance of research that has contributed towards the sterility and lack of profile of the theory for decades now.

The relativists know, of course, that any discussion of the mutual contradictory claims could give rise at any time to a general criticism of the theory, so that this must be avoided at all costs, simply for reasons of self-preservation. In this way the well-founded fear of any criticism also gives rise to a prevention of theory-internal clarification. And so it is that, in addition to the suppression directed outwards (against the critics), a self-applied, subtly working censorship is also applied internally (against their own supporters of the theory).

Laue, Max v.: Das Relativitätsprinzip. 2., verm. edition. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1913. 272 pages. (Die Wissenschaft. 38.).