

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 © Ekkehard Friebe – Oct. 2012

S: Presentations / Error No. 5

The relativists maintain that new ideas and unusual theories only find acceptance with the public gradually, and they console themselves and their public with historical analogies

When authors of the world of relativity see themselves forced to concede the existence of critics - which they only do very reluctantly, and if so then only in connection with the early years of the theory - then they usually argue, to console themselves and their public, with historical analogies in which new physical ideas and theories also - as in the case of the theories of relativity now - had to first become acquainted with the public before they could assert themselves. With this the authors of the world of relativity imply that a rational discussion of prerequisites, assumptions, conclusions and empirical findings is, in the end, ineffective or insufficient as a means of reaching agreement as to the truth or correctness of the theory.

Max Planck expressed this viewpoint in 1933 in his lecture "Ursprung und Auswirkung wissenschaftlicher Ideen" [The Origins and Effects of Scientific Ideas] in the VDI, Berlin, in a much-quoted passage (reprint 1934, p. 267): "An important scientific innovation rarely makes its way by gradually winning over and converting its opponents; it rarely happens that Saul becomes Paul. What does happen is that its opponents gradually die out and that the growing generation is familiarized with the idea from the beginning." cf. in this connection Error S 2.

The hope of gradual adaptation, i.e. acceptance without being rationally convinced, was introduced by the relativists in a behavioural context at a fairly early stage and was repeated continuously. In this connection reference is made to historical alternatives:

(1) *M. Planck (1910, lecture in Königsberg, 1958 reprint, p. 41): "Each of us can certainly recall the difficulty we first had with our childhood capabilities to grasp for the first time that there were people on the earth [the souls of] whose feet directed towards us ... Anyone who nowadays attempts to raise the perceptive difficulties as a reason for objecting to the relative character of all spatial directions, would simply be laughed at. I am not sure that this might not happen to someone who in 500 years casts doubts on the relative character of time." As to "earlier" and "later": "... perhaps no more unacceptable than that 500 years ago the claim that the direction we call vertical was no absolute constant but something that described a cone in space over 24 hours."*

(2) *M. Born (1920, p. 168; 1984, p. 198): "There is no such thing as absolute simultaneity ... difficult to understand that many centuries ... had to pass before this simple fact was recognized. It is the old story of Columbus' egg."*

(3) *M. Born (1920, p. 183; 1984, pp 225-226): "The relativization of the terms length and time duration appears to many people to be difficult; but only because it is something unusual. The relativization of the terms "below" and "above" by the discovery of the fact that the earth is round was certainly one that caused the contemporaries of those days no less difficulties." - 1920, p. 184. "The habit of using the new terms will soon win the day over their unfamiliarity."*

(4) *M. Planck (1934, see above quote).*

(5) *M. Born (1984, p. 222): "On the staying young of the travelling twin: "One must come to terms with it, just as those who, several centuries ago, had to come to terms with the idea of standing upside down at the antipodes."*

Even Max Planck held it for appropriate (lecture on 17.2.1933 in the VDI in Berlin) that physical theories become acceptable not because of the force of their arguments or their empirical proofs, but solely biologically through the dying out of their critics, i.e. by effective majority:

With this, since 1920, a new "paradigm" has been introduced, as we are happy to call new fundamental concepts in science since Thomas S. Kuhn ("Die Struktur wissenschaftlicher Revolutionen." [The Structure of Scientific

Revolutions] 9th edition, 1988). Physics as a war of religions, physical theory as a belief, achievement as conversion, and no mention made of critics and arguments. There are still only opponents, and it's best if the theory spreads "right from the start", which practically speaking means, in physics, always "from above": decided and announced. The underlings have to come to terms with whatever their masters dictate.

This is exactly the scenario in keeping with which the implementation of the STR has been undertaken since 1920. Max Planck's scenario is quoted by the relativists fondly and with a feeling of superiority. It must, in their eyes, be something tremendous in physics to build on dying out instead of on argument and persuasion. The history of physics, however, proves the opposite. The hope of dying out conceals the wish of dying out of the criticism of the theory of relativity. It has fortunately not come to pass and it has little hope of doing so. Even the society named after him can do little to bring this about. The science historians have been unable to detect this new "paradigm" right up to the present day.

One consequence of the new paradigm "war of religions" is, by the way, when the relativists speak of the critics not as critics, but as "enemies". Not all of these critics regard themselves, by the way, as absolute critics of the theory. And the enemies are then attributed characteristics such as being "learn-resistant", "eternally behind the times", "anti-Semitic" etc., only because they express physical criticism. - The criticism too, as a publication, is deprived of the honorary title of "criticism": Arzeliès calls the critical works "nonrelativist". Hentschel (1990) calls them, in the title of his book, just "Interpretationen und Fehlinterpretationen der speziellen und der allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie durch Zeitgenossen Albert Einsteins" [Interpretations and False Interpretations of the Special and the General Theories of Relativity by Contemporaries of Albert Einstein] - There can be no such thing as criticism of something as wonderful as Albert Einstein's theories, at best "false interpretations" and "non-relativistic text". - To the climate of the war of religions it is also fitting that some authors of the world of relativity freely express their absolute loyalty and devoutness before they concern themselves with the criticism, so that they don't run the risk of being accused of heresy. An example is B. L. Marder (1979, "Reisen durch die Raum-Zeit" [Travelling Through Spacetime]) in the Foreword: "Right from the beginning of this study it was clear to me which side in the controversy was right."

Born, Max: Die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins. Unaltered reprint of the 5th edition. Berlin etc.: Springer, 1969. 328 pages. 1st edition 1920. (Heidelberger Taschenbücher. 1.) - Planck, Max: Wege zur physikalischen Erkenntnis." 2nd edition Leipzig. Hirzel 1934. 298 pages. - Planck, Max: Physikalische Abhandlungen und Vorträge. Vol. 3. 1958.