

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. 1

In 1905 Albert Einstein supposedly introduced a "system at rest" without explaining with respect to what this system was "at rest"

According to the principle of relativity there is only relative motion, which is why for each motion it always has to be said with respect to what it is determined. Rest is null motion, therefore the same [reference requirement] also applies to all claims of being at rest.

In 1905 Albert Einstein supposedly introduced a "system at rest" (p. 892, 3rd paragraph) without explaining with respect to what this system was "at rest". This unconnected "system at rest" without a reference thus contradicts his own principle of relativity. The designation "at rest" is supposedly (p. 892) to serve "to distinguish it linguistically from the subsequently introduced ordinate systems" and (p. 892) to "give a more precise presentation".

As to the more precise presentation, this would have been better achieved with a necessary statement as to the reference system with respect to which the "system at rest" is actually at rest. Here Albert Einstein gives no answer. Even in the further course of his treatise he fails to return to this question and thus owes the cause of greater precision an explanation. Since the necessary increase in precision is not provided, his first justification, that of "distinguishing it linguistically" alters its true character. From the supposed linguistic distinction Albert Einstein in fact makes a physical (!) distinction and thereby clandestinely introduces a system absolutely at rest.

This "system at rest" is also treated beyond paragraph 1 (in which it was introduced) in all of Albert Einstein's lines of argument as the system truly "at rest". Evidence: it is never seen - from the other inertial systems - as a relatively "moving" system. The "grand" principle of relativity, in other words, fails to be applied to the "system at rest" right from the start. The effects observed in systems in relative motion are never observed in the supposedly unconnected "system at rest".

With this, Albert Einstein has managed to introduce an inertial system that is no longer subject to the principle of relativity. And it is this "system at rest", with its clandestinely attributed characteristics, that forms the basis for the deduction of length contraction and time dilation as real effects.

As for any "increase in precision", this is unfortunately not the case. Quite the contrary, in fact. The language used is non-uniform, sometimes with inverted commas, sometimes without (pp 895-902) for a coordinate system at rest, a rigid rod at rest, a ruler at rest and (p. 897) even a "space 'at rest'", and without any information whatsoever as to what difference is intended by the same term with inverted commas and without inverted commas.

A clear and explicit statement as to the complete reciprocity between inertial systems can be found in AE 1905 on p. 903, in connection with the shrinkage of moving objects to flat-shaped structures. But he doesn't make explicit mention there of the absolute "system at rest" introduced at the beginning, or emphasize its special status.

The introduction of the reference-free and unconnected "system at rest" is, within the framework of the STR and in keeping with Albert Einstein's own principles, not permissible, and is therefore itself a theoretical error and the source of other serious theoretical errors.

A precise examination of all details as to "moving" and "at rest" in AE 1905 reveals that the relativity propagated by the principle of relativity is continuously violated against, i.e. every detail relating to the states of motion and rest (= zero motion) is fundamentally *only* valid with respect to a specific reference system. In analyzing the text of 1905 all statements for which a reference system is explicitly given, or that are objectively connected to such details so that the same relative connection applies consistently, can be held to be correct. Due to non-fulfilment of the principle of relativity, all other statements of the theory must be classified as adverse to the theory.

The total number of expressions in AE 1905 containing the characteristics of being at rest or moving and set in inverted commas amounts to (page, number of expressions): 892 (1), 895 (2), 896 (5), 897 (1), 903 (2), 913 (2), 917 (1) = altogether 14 expressions in inverted commas, for which no reference system is given with respect to their motion or state of rest. These expressions in inverted commas are mostly used again in the text directly thereafter in the same context, though now without inverted commas and without any information being given as to what has changed.

Here there can be no talk of any particular increase in precision, but only of particular thoughtlessness. Via these 14 expressions in inverted commas Albert Einstein creates a clandestine connection to the "system at rest", introduced unconnected and without a reference on p. 892, and deduces his one-sided effects. - The same evaluation can be made of those cases in which Albert Einstein speaks of "simultaneous" without stating which synchronization procedure he could have carried out (cf. Error D 2).

Albert Einstein's physical, absolutely resting "system at rest" from page 892 presents the still-hidden answer to Herbert Dingle's question as to where in the STR it is determined in which inertial system the famous effects of the kinematics appear as real. So far we have found no discussion, even in the critical literature, of the absolute "system at rest" of page 892. Relativists won't want to "discover" it anyway. - Albert Einstein's physics of the inverted commas governs almost all interpretations of the world of relativity. If an author is unable to give the state of motion or of rest for

a body or a reference system clearly, he gives instead inverted commas, as though this automatically ensures correct understanding, because every reader can attribute his or her own understanding as the correct one.

AE 1905.