

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. 2

From negative statements, positive claims are to be derived

Both theories are founded on negative statements that are listed below as key points so as to show their conspicuous accumulation, an intrinsic evaluation of each statement being given under the corresponding error category:

- (1) *No fluctuations in the speed of light.*
- (2) *No motion faster than the propagation of light.*
- (3) *No dependence of the speed of light on the state of motion of the source.*
- (4) *No absolute motion.*
- (5) *No absolute space.*
- (6) *No rigid bodies.*
- (7) *No absolute time.*
- (8) *No absolute simultaneity.*
- (9) *No exact-running (undisturbed) clocks.*
- (10) *No explicit sequence of events for all observers.*
- (11) *No ether (1905-1920).*
- (12) *No ether drift.*
- (13) *No space in its own right.*
- (14) *No time in its own right.*
- (15) *No cause for length contraction.*
- (16) *No cause for time dilation.*
- (17) *No difference between acceleration due to gravitation and acceleration due to energy-based propulsion.*
- (18) *No difference between inertia and gravitation.*
- (19) *No effects of gravitation on the inertial systems of the STR.*
- (20) *No difference between mechanics and electrodynamics (supposed standardization).*
- (21) *No explanation of phenomena (e.g.: the MME; light deflection; Mercury's perihelion) possible without the two theories of relativity.*

Most of these cases are negative statements on existence that are epistemologically high-risk, i.e. fundamentally speaking they cannot be proven, and a single positive result alone can conclusively refute the negative claim. Several cases construct ideal concepts that cannot be found anywhere within our galaxy. There is therefore no reason to discuss their existence outside our galaxy.

In those cases in which a negative claim is not refuted, i.e. a claim that still retains a certain plausibility or at least the appearance of such, this also brings no useful benefit for the theory, because from a negative claim no positive claim can be deduced and conclusively justified.

Such an impermissible claim is the basis of the theory, as M. v. Laue (1913, p. 16) states in all clarity: "The list of the experiments in which an influence exerted by the motion of the earth was sought could even be greatly increased. None of these showed the sought-after result and in this we have the soundest support for the conviction of the existence of a principle of relativity." In the year 1905 Morley/Miller obtained a measurement of 8.7 km/sec for the drift and in the year of v. Laue's 2nd edition, 1913, Sagnac announced the next positive result of his interferometry experiment with clearly positive running-time differences. M. v. Laue admittedly added a completely correct recognition to his commitment to the "soundest support", though one that he himself failed to follow: "Of course, in generalizing from negative experiences one must be very careful; since a single experiment with a positive result can prove one's position to be impermissible."

With this purely rhetorical exercise in seriousness and caution, the world of relativity has left it at that right up to the present day, preferring to ignore all of the positive proofs of running-time differences available, preferring to deny and suppress, and preferring instead to incessantly extol Albert Einstein's "boldness" as a momentous act.

His bad conscience brings M. v. Laue (1913) to repeatedly justify the STR. In view of its serious conclusions, the STR needs (p. 19) "perhaps more than other theories, evidence of its necessity. Every physical theory can, of course, only find its true support in itself and in the reference to facts." Mere "references", however, do not suffice. Empirical proofs are required, and since v. Laue has nothing of the sort to report, he grasps again for the sheet anchor of the negative claims (p. 19): "After all, there is also in this field a sort of historical necessity that lies in the failure of all other attempts to arrive at a satisfactory understanding of the facts."

The failure of other explanations and the historical necessity is that in which, still in 1913, the supposed physical foundation and necessity of the STR lie.

Later on, these inadequate foundations are no longer conceded so openly by the relativists, because after 1919 the mass media, with the celebration of the observations of the eclipse of the sun, supposedly also saved the STR.

The risk case has already occurred for almost all of the negative statements mentioned, as can be seen in the presentations and proofs relating to the other theoretical errors. This prohibitive physics of the world of relativity must therefore be seen as having failed on two counts: epistemologically, because one cannot derive a positive claim from negative statements; and empirically, because meanwhile most of the negative statements have also been proven false. The theory is based on incorrect assumptions and an incorrect epistemology. It is hardly possible to be wrong more thoroughly.

The conspicuous rhetoric of prohibitive physics (there is no ...; there can be no ...;) finds its logical and stylistic pendant in the equally frequent incantation of the propaganda as to how everything in nature "has to" be, as though we could dictate to nature. Very often these dictates are more carefully bound up with conditional phrases, such as "according to Einstein ...", "if the principle of relativity applies ...", or else more triumphantly, "as Einstein teaches us ..."

In the physics that concerns itself with the phenomena of nature and with findings derived from experiments, by contrast, it is important to recognize the existing relationships and, sometime or other, also to say how nature is without the favourite ideas of revered personalities.

Laue, Max v. 1913. - Sagnac, Georges: L'éther lumineux démontré par l'effet du vent relatif d'éther dans un interféromètre en rotation uniforme. In: Académie des Sciences. Paris. Comptes rendus. 157. 1913, pp 708-710. Contd. pp 1410-1413: Sur la preuve de la réalité de l'éther lumineux par l'expérience de l'interférographe tournant. - Engl. translation in: The Einstein myth and the Ives papers [The luminiferous ether demonstrated by the effect of the relative motion of the ether in an interferometer in uniform rotation].