

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

P: Epistemology / Error No. 1

Advancement of pure speculation, supposition and demands to "principles", and adoption of their claims as "laws", without detailed justification

Albert Einstein gives an example of this advancement process already in his publication of 1905 (pp 891-892): due to the "unsuccessful attempts to discover the motion of the earth relative to the 'medium of light'", whereby he can only refer - without naming it - to the Michelson-Morley experiment (MME) of 1887, he initially arrives (paragraph 2, line 3) at the "supposition" that the concept of an absolute state of rest does not correspond to any observable properties, and that for all coordinate systems, in which the mechanical equations hold, the same electrodynamic and optical laws also hold.

In line 10 he already elevates "this presumption (the content of which is subsequently referred to as the "principle of relativity") to a precondition"

In the process he presents this elevation to a "principle" as a harmless question of linguistic designation, which it is not, because everyone associates a secured state of knowledge with a "principle". But Albert Einstein does not provide such justification for his presumption as to the non-existence of an absolute state of rest. He has not even analyzed the MME and has not outlined why he concludes the non-existence of an absolute state of rest from this experimental result. Even if one believes in its supposed null result, the MME allows only the conclusion that the ether at rest, as assumed by Michelson, is not at rest, because it had not given rise to the expected running-time differences.

There are, in other words, already in the opening passages of the first publication on the STR three serious errors:

(1) The presumption is by no means justified from the literature (that Albert Einstein does not even bother to refer to), nor is it justified anywhere in the treatise.

(2) The presumption is advanced to a "principle" without further justification.

(3) This advancement to a principle is misleadingly declared as purely a question of designation, which it is not. If the author, in the further course of his treatise, had properly referred to his so-called "principle" as just a "presumption" throughout, the uncertainty of a presumption would then have gone into all of his deductions. In clear contrast to this, however, Albert Einstein presents his presumption in the highly styled form of a "principle", as a compelling justification for the subsequently deduced claims about the relativity of simultaneity, time dilation and length contraction.

On p. 895 the "principle" is again defined, a principle that is even above the validity of laws (!). As from p. 896 compelling physical findings are then deduced on the purely presumptive status of the principle: "According to the principle of relativity it is necessary ..." (p. 896); "... that we must not attach an absolute meaning to the terms of simultaneity ..." (p. 897); on the further pages, at the level of "must" and "may", all of the other findings are then sold, now as clearly proven and completely valid, as a matter of course, and are from then on established in the simple indicative, boldly and

irrevocably: p. 904 on the round tour of a clock: " ... after the arrival of this clock at B the two clocks are no longer synchronized ..."; "One sees immediately that this result also still applies ..."; "... so that the latter clock, upon its arrival at A ... is running behind."

This is the epistemological basis for the findings of all relativists, a basis of pure speculation and sheer claims on which to construct the supposedly unavoidably-real findings.

Another case is Albert Einstein's claim (1917, cited according to the 1984 edition) that the propagation of light in a vacuum (that in AE 1905, p. 895, was still a "principle") was a "law" (p. 18), and indeed that there was "hardly a simpler law" in the whole of physics.

In this connection the critics have remarked,

- (1) that the question of the speed of expansion of light is by no means a law, but a question of the empirical measurement of distance per time,
- (2) that the question of the constancy of the readings is again no law, but methodically at best an assumption that can be refuted at any time by a single deviating reading,
- (3) and that the measured running-time differences of Michelson-Morley via Sagnac to Dayton C. Miller have already proven the non-constancy,
- (4) and that by 1916 at the latest, with his GTR, Albert Einstein himself had already abandoned this constancy.

It is a puzzle to the critics why, one year later (1917), he propagated his fairy-tale of the "simplest law of physics" throughout the world, and maintained this stance throughout the subsequent decades.

The trick of presenting incredible claims as conclusively proven on the basis of a presumption is nothing against the trick of propagating this clever procedure over several generations of physicists and mathematicians absolutely successfully. In view of the sweeping success already enjoyed for more than a century, the disinclination of the relativists to take note of any criticism whatsoever, or even of counter-proofs meanwhile furnished, is understandable. No one is ever happy about being driven out of his paradise.

AE 1905. - Einstein, Albert: Über die spezielle und die allgemeine Relativitätstheorie : 21st edition 1969, reprint Braunschweig (etc.) 1984. 130 pages (Wissenschaftliche Taschenbücher. 59.) 1st edition 1917; 16th extended edition 1954; 17th extended edition 1956.