

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

Q: Methodology / Error No. 4

Albert Einstein developed the effects of length contraction and time dilation solely within his kinematics (phoronomy; mechanics), without taking dynamics (force and motion) into consideration

Kinematics treats all motion fundamentally without consideration of the force effects on which it is based. For this reason the conclusions derived from kinematics are not automatic and are not valid without further examination in physical reality. A purely kinematic consideration without allowing for the forces at work can therefore give no findings as to real physical processes. This methodical limitation of kinematics applies generally in physics.

In developing the STR in 1905 Albert Einstein failed to take this methodical limitation of kinematics into account and therefore developed, in pure kinematics, claims as to physical effects that cannot be found in the dynamics of reality. His "inertial systems" that cannot be realized and the "coordinate systems" without material or physical properties lead to incorrect statements and allow no inferences to a reality that is determined by force effects. This is the cause of the absence of any empirical proofs of the supposed kinematic effects.

An example of a purely kinematic consideration is the mistaken claim of the relative equivalence of the Copernican model and the Ptolemaic model of the cosmos: in reality there are forces at work that make the decisive difference, that are only explicable using dynamics and that refute relative equivalence. Regardless of this, the supposed equivalence is already refuted by the analysis of the alleged relative rotation of the fixed-star sky. All fixed stars would have to incidentally revolve around not the centre-point of the earth, but around the earth's axis, endlessly extended in both directions (!), this forming a merely imaginary line and not a physical reality. And why should all of the fixed stars rotate around such an imaginary line based on a geocentric perspective?

Moreover, this supposed relative rotation of the fixed-star sky would also have to hold for every other celestial body with a rotation of its own (e.g. all of the planets of our solar system). In other words, the fixed-star sky would also have to rotate - at the same time - around the countless axes of countless other celestial bodies (including those with another angular velocity (!)). On the other hand it must remain relatively still vis-à-vis certain other celestial bodies not themselves rotating! Due to its particular abstruseness, as well as to the fact that in relativity circles its geniality has been highly praised, this case is particularly instructive in evaluating the world of relativity all in all.

*Galeczki / Marquardt (1997, p. 47): Kinematics is "the presentation of a motion without paying attention to its physical relationships. In terms of the kinematic way of looking at things it makes no difference whether the earth moves around the sun ... or vice versa. From the kinematic standpoint, therefore, only relative speeds are important. [...] As we all know, the kinematic standpoint of the geocentric view of the world was for religious reasons defended for more than 15 centuries against the heliocentric standpoint. The kinematic way of thinking greatly appeals to the original **local** view of things, as seen by mankind. What is important ... for the entire STR is the **local** observer-specific view of describing nature. [...] Constant rectilinear motion ... is ... always presupposed, as a means of making a **thought-out** process as simple as possible. How they ever come to exist in observed nature is of little interest." p. 48: "Kinematics is the playground of unrealistic thought experiments."*

Galeczki / Marquardt (1997, p. 49) invite the relativists to test the supposed kinematic equivalence of all relative motion on the example of subway surfing: "Kinematics does not make one invulnerable, otherwise subway surfing, which has become fashionable, would not be dangerous. We would bet that even the most convinced relativist has not enough trust in the STR to refute this claim experimentally. So why does he believe it on paper?"

The fundamental inadequacy of pure mechanics (kinematics) without the associated force theory (dynamics) has been addressed by a few critics only. The resulting misconceived examples for a relativity-accelerated system (earth and fixed stars; carousel and playground environment), by contrast, are frequently addressed. According to the current status of the documentation, Galeczki/ Marquardt are the only critics who denounce the notable historical step backwards associated with the change from the Copernican to the Ptolemaic view of the world.

Galeczki / Marquardt 1997.