

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. 2

As evidence of the correctness of the theory it is claimed that the clear majority of all physicists accept the STR as having been confirmed

This claim can be found in almost all accounts of the last decade. It suggests that a majority of the physicists cannot be wrong; and it can indeed point to the fact that in the main journals of physics in the leading scientific countries of Europe and America no criticism of the STR is expressed.

The claim is based on two insinuations that have been shown to be incorrect: (1) that a majority of physicists can pass a decree on the correctness of the STR as though it could be decided on the basis of the voting rules in a parliamentary democracy, and (2) that the non-appearance of criticism of the STR in the physics research facilities was due to the non-existence of critics and critical works.

The true situation is completely different.

On Point (1): The correctness of theories, as even some of the relativists themselves know, can never be proven on the basis of reflection. Every physical theory is accepted subject to new empirical findings which can make a correction necessary at any time. Should this situation arise, the theory must then re-establish itself in renewed critical discussion and in examination of its foundations. For the status of the theory, the decisive characteristic is not therefore the number of its followers and representatives, but the existence of critical arguments that have publicly been brought against it, and the quality of the arguments put forward publicly in its defence. This decisive standpoint of permanent consideration - what speaks for it and what against? - is carefully kept secret and suppressed in the presentations of the world of relativity because the STR cannot survive argumentatively in a public debate against the criticism.

On Point (2): The non-appearance of criticism of the STR in the main journals of physics is not the result of their non-existence, but of their systematic denial, suppression and defamation - both of the critics and of their works - by the powers that be in physics. For this reason they have managed for decades to allow any publication of critical works on the STR only under very restricted conditions.

- in non-physics magazines that cannot be fully controlled by the powers that be in physics. Magazines for the natural sciences in general, or for related natural sciences, natural philosophy and epistemology, history of science and science sociology, and also journalism in general;

- in countries that do not belong to the scientific elite in the field of physics and are therefore not strongly represented by persons bound to the international physics research cartel and therefore not easy to blackmail;

- in magazines and publishing companies that care for social fringe groups and splinter groups whose interests and convictions are regarded as sectarian and therefore as scientifically unacceptable (e.g. natural medicine, esoteric, UFO research, extraterrestrial, etc.);

- as independent publications at the cost of the author, who also undertake their own distribution or have their works sold by a commissioned publisher, or who occasionally also set up their own publishing company in order to save their books from the impression of having been self-published, a term regarded by the public as representing poorer-quality, non-edited works.

In view of this situation it is hardly surprising that in the main journals of physics in the leading countries no criticism of the STR is to be found. although the realization that throughout all the decades a continuing

and flourishing criticism of the STR has existed, as indicated by the present documentation of approx. 3800 critical publications, will be all the more surprising to the public. Over the past decade the critical literature on the STR has even experienced a notable upswing due to the existence of several magazines that have given access to the STR criticism in particular.

Even Max Planck held it for appropriate (lecture on 17.2.1933 in the VDI in Berlin, reprint 1934) that physical theories become acceptable *not* because of the force of their arguments or their empirical proofs, but solely biologically through the dying out of their critics, i.e. by effective majority (p. 267): "An important scientific innovation rarely makes its way by gradually winning over and converting its opponents; it rarely happens that Saul becomes Paul. What does happen is that its opponents gradually die out and that the growing generation is familiarized with the idea from the beginning." Physics as a war of religions, physical theory as a belief, achievement as conversion, and no mention made of critics and arguments. There are only opponents, and it's best if the theory spreads "right from the start", which practically speaking means, in physics, always "from above": Decided and announced.

This is exactly the scenario in keeping with which the implementation of the STR has been organized since 1920. Max Planck's scenario is quoted by the relativists fondly and with a feeling of superiority. The hope of dying out conceals the wish of dying out of the criticism of the theory of relativity. It has fortunately not come to pass and it has little hope of doing so. Even the society named after him can do little to bring this about.

Max Planck was not the only relativist with such nice wishes. They are virulent amongst many authors of the world of relativity. Here are just a few examples of how childlike the relativists rejoice, if a critical book no longer appears or is no longer available.

Arzéliès (1966, p. 139) remarks on Bergson's "Durée et simultanéité" and Moreux' "Pour comprendre Einstein" highly satisfied: "Very fortunately it [Moreux] seems to be out of print, as is Bergson's book." In connection with another stubborn critic, against whose book he has explicitly warned, Arzéliès asks himself rhetorically (p. 138): "Are we going to be obliged to re-introduce the Nihil obstat for scientific books?" And indeed, only a real censorship could ensure that everyone reads only orthodox authors and are saved from the atrocities of the criticism.

Fölsing (1994, p. 545) also mentions Henri Bergson's book "Durée et simultanéité" from 1921 and Albert Einstein's written commentary on this ("Bergson ... has dropped a clanger; God will forgive him"), though he did not want to write a review. Fölsing finds consolation: "Understanding publishers later, even without Einstein's critical review, omitted to include this study in Bergson's complete works." A critical book that fails to appear is a victory for the theory. Understanding must be praised.

To the consolation of the critics, Bergson's book is available in the 7th edition, 1992, unaltered, fresh and readable. The critics, by contrast, do not wish any non-appearance of books, but only the appearance of their works too.

Planck, Max: *Wege zur physikalischen Erkenntnis.* 2nd edition Leipzig. Hirzel 1934. 298 pages - Arzéliès, Henri: *Relativistic kinematics.* Oxford: Pergamon, 1966. 298 pages - Bergson, Henri: *Durée et simultanéité* [7. éd.] : à propos de la théorie d'Einstein. 1. éd. "Quadrige". Paris: Pr. Univ. de France, 1992. 216 pages (Quadrige. 141.) - Fölsing, Albrecht: *Albert Einstein.* 3rd edition. Frankfurt a.M. 1994. 959 pages.