

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. 5

The two fundamental postulates of the STR (the principle of relativity; the constancy of the speed of light) are said to be compatible with each other

When Albert Einstein combines the principle of relativity (PR) of the STR with the claim of the constancy of the speed of light (constancy of c) in a vacuum (AE 1905, pp 891-892), he describes the constancy of c as being "only apparently incompatible" with the PR. In the definition of the constancy of c given 3 pages later (p. 895) he adds, as a further condition, the independence of the speed of light from the motion of the source. First on p. 899 he explicitly unfolds the farther-reaching condition that the constancy of c is also to be measured with the same value in different moving systems, i.e. independent of the state of motion of the measuring observers, whereby he introduces for the speed of light a supposed non-relativity.

With this, all 4 aspects of his "principle" of the constancy of c have been given:

- (1) vacuum,*
- (2) independent of source,*
- (3) independent of the observer,*
- (4) non-relativity.*

Most critics analyze Albert Einstein's principle of the constancy of c , which in this sense is his own creation, and come to the conclusion that it is not "only apparently incompatible" with the PR, but completely contradicts it. And there are, for a principle with these 4 characteristics, no physical indicators and no proof.

Neither Albert Einstein nor any of his followers have been able to prove the alleged non-relativity of light propagation.

In a careful analysis of the statements of the STR, B. J. Gut (1981) points two things out: (1) that the postulate of a constant speed of light in a vacuum for all inertial systems and the postulate that the laws found in one inertial system are also valid in all others inertial systems are incompatible; and (2) that even the usual derivations of the transformations are logically untenable.

Since Albert Einstein's justification for a non-relativity of the speed of light makes use of the Lorentz transformations and is thereby derived from his interpretation of the supposedly null result of the entirely incompletely implemented Michelson-Morley experiment of 1887 (supposedly no running-time differences), every positive experimental result of the running-time differences must logically invalidate the justification for non-relativity. Through the Sagnac results (1913) and later those of D. C. Miller (1925 and 1926) this has happened repeatedly and irrefutably.

The compatibility claimed by Albert Einstein has not only been shown by the criticism to be logically untenable, one of the two components, the non-relativity of the propagation of light, has even been dispelled by empirical proofs, so that the question of compatibility no longer presents itself. The proven untenable nature of the compatibility as presented by Gut (1981) attacks the very substance of the theory and has so far not even been addressed by the relativists (cf. Errors B 1 and B 2).

The matter relates to the incompatibility of the principle of relativity and the absolute constancy of c . B. J. Gut shows that the all-embracing inconsistency in the relativistic accounts have their origins in an unbelievable lack of care already found in the elementary concepts and claims introduced by Albert

Einstein. The physicists in the world of relativity occupy themselves preferentially with mathematical constructions and they believe that the mathematics can serve as a justification for all and any claims. For this reason they disregard the indispensable rule applicable to every scientific speech, namely that contradictions and logical errors identified must be explained by all of those involved and must be argumentatively resolved, if a new state of knowledge is to be plausibly justified.

With their systematic denial and suppression of every bit of criticism the relativists rob not only the public at large, but also themselves of the knowledge of the current state of the debate. By their non-reception of such works as those of B. J. Gut they find themselves in a position in which they cannot even know why their theory is already inherently devoid of every basis, quite apart from their incorrect assumptions as to experimental findings and the consequent suppression of clear experimental refutations.

Evaluation of the Science Citation Index for the years 1982-2000 reveals, for example, that the work of B. J. Gut (1981) has not been cited in the 19 years since its appearance. This case shows conclusively that the relativists only accept flattery from the epistemological and natural philosophers (e.g. Schlick, 1917; Cassirer, 1921) and adorn themselves with this. If, however, any criticism is expressed this is normally dismissed as "non-physical" and as non-authoritative due to a lack of mathematical competence, and is officially ignored. M. v. Laue has explicitly declared that he does not even read anything of the sort.

AE 1905. - Gut, Bernardo Juan: Immanent-logische Kritik der Relativitätstheorie. Oberwil b. Zug: Kugler, 1981. 151 pages.