In Poincare's theory of relativity presented by me, I showed the elementary logic with the help of which the physical meaning of the theory of relativity becomes clear, and, in particular, according to this logic, as I showed earlier, the paradoxes of the theory of relativity are easily explained.

Now I will show this elementary explanation in more detail, in this case by the example of the well-known "Paradox of twins".

Einstein was unable to give a simple explanation of the "Paradox of the Twins." In the framework of the "Special Theory of Relativity", the explanation of the "Paradox of the Twins" was not given at all.

I naturally explain the "Paradox of the Twins", as I previously did in the framework of the "Poincare theory of relativity", which is formally the same as the "Special Theory of Relativity".

First, let's see what the "Paradox of twins" means from the point of view of modern "science" and "average man." Strange as it may seem, the views of modern science and the "philistine" in this case coincide, although after reading this article, the reader will understand that besides the glance " modern science "there is also the view of true science.

So, the problem of the "Paradox of twins" from the point of view of mass consciousness is determined in the following way. We have a rocket that flies away from us at a certain speed. The clock on the rocket, according to the theory of relativity, slows down. Further, the rocket turns around and flies back they slow down again, so the person who made the flight turns out to be younger. The paradox in this problem is that from the point of view of the pilot - in both cases the earth moved, and therefore, the person on earth should be younger, not the pilot.

Those who think or have heard that Einstein, or someone else, solved this problem, are deeply mistaken, because with such a formulation of the problem, solutions for such a task cannot exist at all. That is, we will have on one side younger a pilot, and on the other hand, a younger earthling. That, as everyone understands, is absurd. But what is clear to any person is not understandable to physicists, and they prove that the paradox has a solution.

How do physicists prove the "Paradox twins"? As always, it's very simple - that is, they don't prove it. Physicists say that the "Paradox of the Twins" does not exist, because, according to the theory, only the pilot turns out to be younger, and that's true.But, after all, they were asked about a completely different thing. In what way, the "slowdown plus the slowdown" of the "earthman's watch" results in the "acceleration" of his time, and the earthling is older than the "pilot".Physicists prefer not to answer this "second question" (although in theory this question is "first" and main, not "second"). This is exactly what Einstein tried to prove, and he naturally could not do it. According to Einstein's proof, when the rocket starts, then from the point of view of the "pilot" the clock on the ground does not go slower, but it's faster and results in the final result, from the point of view of the "pilot" he turns out to be younger, and therefore the result coincides, that is, in both cases the pilot is younger.

Of all this Einstein nonsense, a cunning scientist can however draw a useful conclusion. Einstein, as will be shown below, "thinks" in the right direction. More precisely, Einstein knows the solution, but if he

writes it, then from that point on, Einstein will become Poincare and what will become of Einstein is not difficult to predict.

So, according to Einstein's "proof", from the point of view of a flying "pilot", the clock on the ground slowed down both "there" and "back", but thanks to the invented Einstein's trick with "rocket acceleration", it turned out that the "earthling" is again older.

Now let's take a look at this matter from the point of view of normal science.So, we have a rocket that flies away from us at a certain speed. The clock on the rocket slows down. Next, the rocket flies back, and the clock on it, as I wrote earlier, according to normal science, is ticking, in general, faster. And even in this heavier and more general case, the pilot, from the point of view of real science, will always be younger, and the problem with the twin paradox is solved. The general case assumes that the earth is also moving.

Let's look at this task in more detail.

Suppose that we, together with the Earth, are moving "right", relative to the "fixed system", and the rocket is also moving to the right.

According to Poincaré's Theory of Relativity, our clocks slowed down relative to the "fixed system", and the clock on a flying rocket slowed down even more than ours. When the rocket flies back, its clocks will go FASTER than our clocks. Despite this,since the SLOWNING of the clock on the rocket, when it moves away from us, lasts longer,then, in aggregate, "absolute and long" time delay when flying "there" exceeds the frequency of the rocket's hours during the return flight, and in total and as a result, the pilot will be younger than the earthling.

Before turning to the opposite case of "Pilot-Earthling", we will look at the logic described above in more detail, as I mentioned in the article on Poincare's theory of relativity.This will help us better understand the first part, and prepare us to understand the second part of the "Paradox of the Twins."

Suppose we have an Absolute reference system, where the time of the movement of the light "there" and "back" is the same (by analogy, waves on the lake). We let the light from point A to point B, then the light reflected and came back to point A.At point A, we have a pendulum that counts down the time. The pendulum at point A cannot know when the light will come to point B, since the pendulum stands still, the pendulum can show only when the light returns, that is, the pendulum can determine only time spent by the light "round-trip". So as on a quiet "lake" there and back will be the same if, for example, the back and forth pendulum showed-4 oscillations, it means that the clock at point B should show two oscillations at the moment when the light reaches them. But if you do the same on a moving ship , while the wave will catch up with the nose of the ship will pass more oscillations than back. The principle of relativity Poincare is based on the fact that sitting in a traveling train with the windows closed, where the light goes one way slower, and "back" is faster, we can not determine how many blows of the pendulum the light will pass "forward" and how many "back", so same as in the case of a moving ship. Suppose that we have point A at the tail of the train, and at the beginning of the train is point B.Suppose that the pendulum at point A showed that in the train the light "round-trip" passed in four oscillations (seconds).

Actually, the light went "there" more than "back", but the pendulums stand in their places and do not zaut about it.Assume for convenience that "there" is from point A to point B, the light passed in three vibrations, and back for one oscillation.

Suppose, for convenience, that "there", from point A to point B, the light passed through three oscillations, and back in one oscillation.

Sitting on a train, we can only know that the pendulum at point A showed that the light went back and forth in four oscillations. Therefore, we are forced to put at point B" artificial time "(virtual time) - and this time is the same as we set on the “lake”, since we do not know how fast our train is traveling (or the ship is floating). So, 3 oscillations passed at point B, while the light was going from point A to point B, but we don’t borrow it and therefore put at point B - "2" oscillations (seconds) instead of three - which means - moving the arrow at point B one "second" backwards. In order agree on all the details, Poincare introduces a time dilation of moving bodies. That is, what we translated arrows was, as it were, regardless of the slowdown in and therefore we did not talk about it, but nothing passes without a trace, and Poincaré was forced to slow down time for the "new law of nature" so that the switch of arrows was also physically determined. So according to the additional concept of Poincaré, the faster the body moves its pendulums swing more slowly.

Now we can return to the case of the “Paradox of the Twins.” In the case of the “Earthman-Pilot”, we consider a general example when the earth moves “to the right” and the rocket flies away “to the right” and returns. From the point of view of Earthling Rocket flies from point A to point B by analogy with the light, and for convenience we will apply the same proportion of time, although it was too high for convenience for light, and for a rocket it will be even more high, but the point is not “overestimation”, but that this principle ” more-less "reflects what is happening. Suppose that if the earth rested like a "lake", then the pendulums of a "clock" in a rocket would reach point B and show 1.5 oscillations and back, respectively, the same amount — this corresponds to the Poincaré principle that the time of moving bodies slows down. In the example of a fixed earth, we have that, according to the testimony of the earth's pendulums at point A, the rocket "back and forth" spent 4 vibrations. And the rocket pendulums showed "round-trip" -3 vibrations (1.5 + 1.5). According to the Poincaré principle any body, regardless of its speed, having come to point B will see on the clock point B half of what it sees then returning to point A., although in this case this is not essential, since this is a consequence of the equal-velocity calculation. Fundamentally, the rocket pendulums will show the same number of oscillations back and forth — in our case, 1.5 and 1.5.

So, let's move on to the mechanism that shows why the pilot turned out to be younger in the first general case. I described this mechanism earlier by presenting Poincaré’s Theory of Relativity.

The earth moves “to the right” relative to the Absolute system, and its clock is therefore slow (the latter does not matter). The rocket flies faster than the earth “to the right” and the rocket pendulums therefore oscillate more slowly than the pendulums on earth.

A rocket flies from point A to point B, by analogy with light, more oscillations of the earth's pendulums, as I agreed, 3, When a rocket flies back, its pendulums generally oscillate faster than the pendulums on Earth, but it flies less time as I above-1 oscillation. And although the deceleration (and acceleration) of moving pendulums is not proportional to speed, it is enough,so that together with a long flight time, the slowdown time exceeded the increase in a shorter time. Poincare formulas, as well as their equal written off from Poincaré, Einstein's formulas will show that the slowing down of time in general will give the same result as if the earth were resting like a lake, that is, the earthling's clock shows –4 oscillations , and the pilot will actually be younger. But since the classic case (when the Earth is not moving), we are only interested in formal confirmation, I brought the mechanism when the rocket pendulums oscillate slower than back, which is what a matter of ordinary life provided

that the Poincaré principle really exists, and on which all modern physics insists, which for some reason simply calls all this "the theory of relativity, the schoolboy's-Einstein's".

The reverse case is of the most interest: - "pilot-earthling." If in the first case, physicists manage to circumvent their ignorance of the occurring physical phenomena due to the fact that the Poincaré principle formally equates the moving systems and the absolute space, with the help of which they explain the first case, although everywhere they say that absolute space is not recognized. In the second-opposite case, such liberty leads them to the absurd, and the result is that now surely the earthling must become younger, not the pilot. Similar absurdity is already superior , even science fiction, which physicists used to respect from childhood and materialized as Einstein's "theory." Therefore, we must accept that at the same time an earthling will also be younger they do not agree, and therefore, the second integral and indispensable part of the proof of the "paradox of twins" is still not existed.

Although applying the true concept of Poincaré, it's not crazy, under the name of "modern physics", it is also possible to simply show the second missing part of the twin paradox.

So, the secret of the second part of the twin paradox is not at all cunninger than the first, although the first general case described above was not known to physicists either.

The secret of the "rocket-land" case is only in the illegal use of "artificial" Poincare time, or as I called it earlier "Poincare local time".

The trick is that, as I pointed out in my first article, the slowing down of an earthling's clock from the point of view of a pilot is not real, but is calculated by artificially translated arrows, and not by pendulums. Moreover, intermediate clocks cannot be taken into account in calculations where and final are comparisons of the indications of the same pendulums.

The fallacy of reasoning is that physicists unreasonably replace virtual time and the corresponding virtual deceleration with real time and deceleration.

For a more detailed explanation, let us take the classic case in which the earth is stationary. In general, the error of the Einstenista arises in the same place, due to an unreasonable notion and an overestimation of the real time dilation.

So, the earth rests and the rocket flies "parallel" from point A to point B. At point B, the earth's pendulums showed two oscillations (and the clock in this classic case, when the reference system is Absolute, shows the same thing as the pendulums

that is, two oscillations (seconds). At the same time, the rocket pendulums will show at point B, according to the above agreement, 1.5 oscillations. Points A and B are simultaneously viewed from the point of view of the pilot, because the rocket is flying really from point A to point B .

A rocket flies with its own time scale. The rocket's time scale is a ruler stretched in both directions to infinity, on which there are clocks at each point with shifted arrows. Thus, from the point of view of the rocket, the Earth moves in the opposite direction from some point B2 to point A2, as was shown above, the clock "to the right" at point B2 is shifted backwards, that is,

according to the rocket clock readings at B2, the Earth begins to move earlier the arrows of the rocket show at A2.Based on this, physics makes a conclusion that the Earth spent more time on movement than the rocket pendulums show.. The time difference between the arrows of point B2 and point A2 is such that the 2 oscillations that passed during the flight of the rocket in one direction, according to the pendulum on the earth, will be less than the time measured by the arrows of the rocket clock. That is, the pendulums of the earth and the clock of a stationary Earth initially showed that a rocket from point A to point B flew 2 oscillations, the pendulums of the rocket showed a true slowdown of 1.5 oscillations, and the clock of the rocket showed more than two (we denote it as 2.5), there is in terms of rocket time on the earth flowed more slowly, although in reality it was the opposite.

But even this is not everything. When a rocket soars to fly back at a point B, it accordingly changes the time scale to the opposite "herringbone", as a result of which the earth again flew more than 2.5 vibrations, although the rocket pendulums show the result of 1.5 oscillations. And the "physicists" again take this value more than 2 and say that the earthling looked younger, as he had 2 oscillations, and on the rocket 2.5.

Let's look once more physically at these problems. The faster the rocket flies "to the right", the slower its own time flows, and at the same time, time on the earth continues to flow regardless of the rocket's flight, in general it should be that the faster the rocket flies the faster from her point of view time flows on the ground, as the rocket's own time slows down, but Einstein and his followers convince us and ourselves that the faster the rocket flies, the slower from its point of view time flows on the ground. As shown in the previous paragraph, a similar look rests not for the true time of the rocket, but for the time scale associated with the rocket, similar reasoning puts virtual time at the forefront, which arises as a result of artificially translated clock. But if we distinguish virtual time from real time, we thereby understand what is actually happening. But recognizing the existence of "virtual time" means abandoning the forgery that was slipped to us by Einstein, Minkows s and help them German engineering razvedka.V case of the "twin paradox" Einstein sat in a puddle, as the end of the task there is a comparison between the real pendulum clock, showing the true vremya.I here, they had to admit that there is no symmetrically.

But to recognize that real and virtual time is not the same thing, and each type of time fulfills only the task assigned to it, Einstein was naturally afraid. For this reason, the "Paradox of the Twins" has not been

proven to date.

To explain the "Paradox of the Twins", Einstein attracted gravity. Einstein's proof is not only doubtful, but also from the point of view of science is unacceptable, because in setting the problem, time delay and all initial parameters of the problem act without taking into account gravity.

Moreover, the proof applied by Einstein is so absurd that schoolchildren reliably and easily refute it. It is enough just to increase the path of the rocket, and the contribution Einsteins has accumulated during the acceleration is canceled.

According to Einstein's logic, in the evidence he gave, it turns out that if he didn't have the "initial acceleration of the rocket" invented from his finger, the earthman should also be younger than the pilot. And if we considered the case of flight and rejuvenation of the pilot without acceleration, then an earthling is also obliged to go out without acceleration, and thus Einstein contradicts himself, since in this case it is not clear whose age really will be younger for Einstein, if you throw away unnecessary acceleration.

However, Einstein insists and "without proof" that the pilot will still be younger. This suggests that Einstein knows the real proof from the point of view of the Poincaré Principle. What then can Einstein suggest to us — everyone knows — to show the language. That is, Einstein guessed that someday we would still figure out what the matter was and appreciate his "joke with the language".

Chief Soviet dissident, chief physicist and mathematician: -Henrich Leonidovich Arutyunov. (not rehabilitated)

http://kgb.schizophrenia.dissident-gs.org/

http://schleichenden.schizophrenie.kgb.perestroika.eu/

888