

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. 4

Appearance and existence: AE 1905 changes his expressed position on length contraction and time dilation several times, wavering between "appears to be" and "is" and thereby implanting a fundamental contradiction in his theory

With this Albert Einstein himself introduces an element of uncertainty into the theory, that neither he nor any of his authoritative followers has ever corrected. The criticism has refuted both possibilities, A (= appearance) and R (= reality): (A) if the effects are only "apparent", then they cannot at the same time be claimed to be real; (R) if the effects are "real", they cannot be proven, nor can a cause be given.

The fundamental contradiction is often addressed in the presentations and then, at the whim of the authors, dismissed again by way of a high-handed decision. In this connection first two, then three clearly separate groups have appeared amongst the relativists:

The A group (appearance) insists on complete symmetry of the inertial systems, and thereby on complete reciprocity of the effects (length contraction, time dilation) that therefore appear simultaneously in the two systems that are always considered, and as a consequence are "not real". This A group can fall back on Albert Einstein's own statements (1905, p. 895): "The laws ... are independent of which of (any) two coordinate systems with constant relative motion, with respect to each other, it is to which these alterations of state relate." (p. 903): "It is clear that the same results hold for bodies at rest in a system "at rest", as observed from a constantly-moving system." Moreover, as regards the effects Albert Einstein also speaks repeatedly of "appears" or "as observed from the system at rest". As a consequence the two said effects are only apparent, and after the meeting of both systems length contraction and time dilation have vanished again, i.e. rulers and clocks again agree with each other.

The concepts of symmetry and reciprocity are judged to be so significant by some mistrusting authors that they explicitly formulate reciprocity as an additional principle, so that nobody can overlook it. These authors can then no longer accept the clock paradox / twins paradox and opt instead for one of two alternatives: either they dispute the effect (whereby they break the ranks of the orthodox in the world of relativity) or they do not mention it at all (whereby they retain their devoutness via their silence). Both alternatives within (A) do not prevent their representatives from declaring themselves to be faithful followers of the theory. There are, however, also authors who, by opting for this alternative, then take their leave of the world of relativity and join the ranks of the critics. The most prominent example is Herbert Dingle.

The R group (reality) declares both effects (length contraction, time dilation) to be real and are able to fall back on the words of Albert Einstein himself (1905, p. 904): "If there are two synchronized-running clocks at A and if one moves one of these clocks along a closed curve at constant speed until it returns to A again, ... the latter clock, upon its arrival at A, is found to be running behind the clock that has remained unmoved by [formula]." This claim by Albert Einstein himself in favour of reality is expressed indisputably and absolutely. The only difficulty that authors of this group see is in justifying the round trip undertaken by the moved clock as inertial motion (not rectilinear, and - due to changes in direction - not without acceleration). They therefore want to "correct" Albert Einstein's "error" of 1905 by claiming that the real time difference arises exactly from this inertial motion, something about which Albert Einstein says nothing. His theory is therefore, without his help and against him, corrected and justified. With this the erroneous nature of the theory is confirmed in this point by the relativists themselves, for which the critics must be very thankful.

Due to the appearance of acceleration, some authors subsequently explain this process outlined in 1905 as a case for the GTR of 1916. With this they accuse Albert Einstein of having made a grave and categorical error, namely that he had entirely failed to recognize the inadmissibility of the process in his theory of 1905.

Furthermore, a not-unimportant "A/R group" of authors has also emerged, a group which begins its presentation with the A alternative and then, sometime or other, elegantly switches to the R alternative without announcing this to their public, and perhaps even without noticing this themselves. These people naturally have an easy time. They win over their public with the harmless and, by each gullible reader, easy-to-understand A alternative and then surprise them suddenly with the wonderful real effects and an explanation in keeping with the R alternative. For the informed reader, this step is actually easy to recognize. The uninformed reader, though, has normally little chance, since his credulity gives the world of relativity a trust advantage, and he cannot imagine the true situation and wouldn't believe it if he could.

The allusion that not all of the authors of the world of relativity have maintained their position in the course the years, but have altered it, which is everyone's good right, is nevertheless imperative. Some change their opinions, though, without pointing out to their readers this change with respect to their former position in earlier publications. Before discussing the position of a relativistic author one should therefore first ascertain that one is referring to the same publication.

The critics have repeatedly demanded a correction of the fundamental contradiction of the STR, e.g. H. C. Browne (1922). He refers to the contradictory statements as to the discussion with Einstein in Paris in April 1922 on the twins paradox. Bergson maintains that paradoxes are a compelling consequence of the theory; and Nordmann maintains that it is a fiction that does not derive from Einstein. Both refer to supposed statements made by Einstein. Browne demands clarification of this discrepancy. The world of relativity, however, appears to have had no interest in this - for the past 8 decades. Quite the contrary, in fact; the more contradictions there are, the more versions of the theory there are, and correspondingly more excuses for use against the critics.

Some authors of the world of relativity find Albert Einstein's fundamental contradiction so disagreeable and embarrassing that they opt for very peculiar ways of avoiding it. Some of them simply deny explicitly that Albert Einstein has made any contradictory statements at all, and declare the alternatives chosen by him as the only available solutions. The others declare the very impression of a contradiction as "senseless" and want to dismiss it by means of particularly clever explanations. One such is the famous "slice of sausage" explanation from Max Born (from the 1st edition in 1920, p. 183, until the last edition in 1969, p. 219), who simply declared all of the different possible cuts of sausage to be equally real and believed, with this explanation, to have solved the problem. The motto? Everyone may cut a slice of sausage for himself at random - and each slice is indeed real? Whereby, of course, the question under discussion is not in the least explained. The "slice of sausage" from Max Born confirms, if one is to take it seriously, only the reproach of general relativity against the theory, simply making the matter all the worse.

Authors of the A group (symmetry, reciprocity, appearance of the effects): H. Dingle; Nordmann; Sexl 1978.

Authors of the R group (asymmetry, no reciprocity, reality of the effects): Langevin; McCrea; Rindler. Essential relativity.

Authors of the A/R group (all imaginable variants mixed): Albert Einstein; Born.

AE 1905. - Browne, H. C.: Einstein's paradox. In: Nature. London. Vol. 110. 1922, No. 2768, 18th Nov., pp 668-669. - Born, Max: Die Relativitätstheorie : with 143 photos / Max Born; under co-work from Walter Biem. Unchanged reprint of the 5th edition.. Berlin etc.: Springer, 1969. 328 pages. (Heidelberger Taschenbücher. 1.) 1. edition 1920.