

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

O: Experiment / Error No. 2

**Albert Einstein and the relativists claim, for their thought experiments, the status of [real] experiments and refer to "thought [i.e. imagined] experiences"**

*Albert Einstein has introduced the tool of the so-called thought experiment as a means of justifying his theories and proving them. A large part of the discussion in the world of relativity concerns itself with more or less correct accounts of these thought experiments, with interpretations, corrections and reinterpretations, that are always presented as decisive findings in physics which nobody dare "repudiate".*

*Only a small number of the critics address the topic of the methodical problems of the thought experiments, which are no experiments at all, but are thoughts without experiments, and [these critics] come to devastating judgements as to the methods employed and the results obtained. The following aspects are discussed:*

*(1) The so-called "thought experiment" consists solely of thoughts and lacks every aspect of experiment. The very use of the term "experiment" is misleading and serves only as part of the psychological manipulation of the public and the worming towards an experience-oriented status that is not given here.*

*(2) In these thoughts without experiments the narrator, Albert Einstein, determines how nature is made, what measuring devices show, and what observers see, and he processes the results obtained in this way, from supposed experiments to mathematical calculations that then serve as fundamental facts of the theory and are presented as physical laws. With the obtainment of experimental status and the subsequent mathematical ado, a thought blockage is already created, purely psychologically, amongst the profession-specific public, whereas the general public is downright deceived.*

*(3) These thoughts without experiments can also never fail, because the experiment is missing. The appearance of irrefutability is thereby awakened and cultivated.*

*(4) The status of the thoughts without experiments in the world of relativity tends to lead to non-attention to and a non-conducting of experiments, particularly if the results of the experiments do not confirm the theories or even refute them. This is the case with the universal non-attention paid to the interference experiments with positive running-time differences of Sagnac and Dayton C. Miller in which the accounts of the STR of the world of relativity were particularly easy to ignore. This was also the case with the experimental findings on unipolar induction which, had they become generally known, could have ruined the standing of the theory [of relativity] in the eyes of the public.*

*(5) The elevation of thoughts without experiments to the basis of the formation of theory has distanced the so-called "theoretical" or "mathematical" physics from experimental physics, has devalued experimental physics and has hindered a fruitful debate between experience and reflection in the field of electrodynamics, and thereby the progress of publicly financed research.*

*(6) The typical, almost exclusive handling of thoughts without experiments blossomed particularly in the presentations of Albert Einstein, when he speaks, for example, of "thought experiences" (AE 1905, p. 894): "certain (thought-out) physical experiences", or when he believes that an appropriate choice of the coordinate system "alters" the gravitation. These indications of megalomania are, of course, seen by the youngsters in the world of relativity as a sign of their superiority.*

(7) Theimer (1977, p. 36): "In his thought experiments Einstein always lets the figures think in such a way that the theory of relativity results. In logic one calls this a *petitio principii*." What Theimer diagnoses as a circular argument, by which, due to the suggestive effects of the production and to the fictional dialogue, we lose an appearance of reality, can these days be still more strongly abused with the help of modern presentation techniques and the use of the AV media in lessons and courses of study.

Galeczki/Marquardt (1997) were fairly frequently able to point to contra-relativistic assumptions in the thoughts without experiments, these assumptions leading inevitably to an incorrect physics, e.g.: p. 42: "A thought experiment is like a tightrope act in which, if necessary, one can also do without the tightrope." - p. 47: "The constant rectilinear motion is a particularly delicate chapter in the history of physics, though especially this is always *presupposed* in order to make a *thought-out* process as easy as possible. How they ever come to exist in observed nature is of little interest." One furthermore assumes friction-free systems - moving point-like masses without any interaction, without mass yet stable reference systems. "With this all of the requisites for *fantasy mechanics* have been selected and one can now 'observe' as one pleases." - p. 99: Accelerated particles are not permitted to expend energy in the form of radiation. - p. 99: An increase in particle speeds without the help of any forces whatsoever, "since accelerations per decree are excluded".

All of the conditions mentioned violate physical experience. And in the case of the "*thought experiences*" one really does not know whether one ought to laugh or to cry.

A branch that is no longer able to distinguish between suggestions for, and reflections on, experiments and experiments as such, is living dangerously. A branch that already regards reflections as experiments is no longer living at all. A branch that sells reflections to the general public as experiments is highly dangerous and must be publicly called to account.

AE 1905, p. 894. - Theimer 1977. - Galeczki/Marquardt 1997.