

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. 6

The existence of bodies exhibiting constant rectilinear motion (inertial systems) is too much of a rarity from which to obtain, by way of observance, globally valid findings

Albert Einstein limits the validity of his STR to bodies exhibiting constant rectilinear motion (inertial systems). On such a body the fact that it exhibits constant rectilinear motion is to be experimentally established. One logical conclusion of this condition is the absence of gravitation.

This limited area of application becomes particularly apparent in view of the fact that, in reality, motion is almost solely observable as rotational motion, or as different accelerations, or as non-constant and non-rectilinear motion. Every geostationary location rotates around the earth's axis, on the earth's orbit around the sun, with the solar system in the arm of the galaxy around the centre of the galaxy, and moves with the galaxy in our galactic pile.

The limitation to the absence of gravitation is even more unrealistic with the GTR. According to E. Mach, all inertial effects on the earth are effects of the gravitational masses of our galaxy, and this argument is happily used by the relativists to answer Lenard's critical question as to why in a braking railway wagon everything collapses together, but the church steeple next to the railway line does not fall down. The gravitational masses of the fixed stars of our galaxy are said to invoke forces of inertia on the loose items in the train. But how can any inertial system anywhere be free of gravitational effects if the gravitational masses of the fixed stars can exert such massive effects in each railway wagon on the earth?

From these two findings (no gravity-free space, and no inertial systems) in the real world one must conclude that the STR can exist only on paper and in the so-called thought experiments, that are only ideas without experiments. On no account should any claims of the STR whatsoever be applied to a real world for which the theory cannot apply. Because of these prerequisites, the STR can never provide a basis for supposed changes in our general concepts, e.g. as to space and time.

The relativists ought to decide between the assumption of inertial systems and the assumption of Mach's idea of the effect of the distant masses of the fixed stars. Accepting both at the same time is logically unacceptable.

The contradiction between the inertial system and Mach's principle is naturally only one concrete example of the fundamental incompatibility of the STR and the GTR: The STR works with the inertial system, and the GTR works with Mach's principle, and each excludes the other. This also shows the frailty of the relativistic argumentation. Between both theories there is a transition or a supplementation relationship normally identified by the treatment of the speed of light. The inertial system and Mach's principle, however, are completely independent of questions as to the speed of light.

It is inexplicable how Albert Einstein and all relativists can believe that the statements of such a restricted theory for very rare, special cases (STR) - even if they could be flawlessly derived and empirically confirmed - can deserve to acquire any general, fundamental, global importance.