*****

The “ladder paradox”, a decision, for the first time in 110 years.

In the represented earlier by me Poincare’s theory of relativity, I said, what the converse length contraction are virtual (unrealistic) and are a consequence of the “virtual time” introduced by Poincare, which I called “local Poincare time.” Now we consider this in more detail, using the so-called "Ladder paradox" as an example.

Usually, to measure the length, we simply apply the scale. But if the body moves, then it becomes not clear how to measure it. Intuitively clear, in order to measure a moving body it is necessary to instantly and simultaneously apply a ruler to the measured body. Thus, to measure a moving body, it is necessary to have not only a measuring scale, but also a clock. Suppose a rod moves and we measured it and got a size of 1 meter. We measured it instantly, that is, they applied a scale 1 meter long at the ends of which the clock at the time of measurement showed the same time. It turns out that if the clock on the measuring scale shows the wrong time, then the measurement result will not be correct. This is the secret to solving the "Ladder Paradox".

In short, Einstein uses the clock synchronization coined by Poincare, thereby introducing artificial virtual time (“local Poincare time”). Measurements using artificial time give unrealistic dimensions, but by declaring “system independence”, Einstein thereby turns virtual time into Einstein’s “real” and, accordingly, as a result of measurement using artificial time, unrealistic dimensions turn into real ones. A garage that really has a larger size turns out to be smaller for Einstein. Because of this and a situation arises with Paradoxes, the solution of which physicists have not yet given, and the solution of “paradoxes” in the framework of Einstein’s fake theory is impossible at all. A detailed analysis of the "Ladder Paradox" is given below.

Einstein also writes in his work that when measuring moving objects, the arrows on the scale should show the same time. However, Einstein refused to give an explanation of the "Ladder Paradox". Einstein came up with a fake explanation of the “Twins paradox”, but he couldn’t come up with a fake explanation of the "Ladder Paradox".

Why Einstein refused to give a solution to the "Ladder Paradox", will become clear at the end of this article.

What is the "Ladder Paradox"? We have a “resting”(motionless) garage with two doors, and there is a ladder equal in length to it. If the ladder flies, then according to the theory of relativity it is shortened and completely placed in the garage and the garage doors “at the same time”, according to the clock installed on the doors, are closed, and the ladder turns out to be completely in the garage. But from the point of view of the ladder , the garage flies and from the point of view of the ladder , the garage has become smaller, that is, the ladder should no longer fit in the garage.

How does modern science prove the "Ladder Paradox"? Just like in the case of the “Twin paradox”, modern science proves that from the point of view of the ladder, although the garage has become smaller, the ladder will still fit in the garage.

As I have shown in the case of the “Twin paradox”, the method of proof, as a result of which, only one answer is obtained, suggests that the reference systems are physically not equal. When the systems are physically equal, from the point of view of the ladder, the ladder to the garage is not will fit.

Consider this in more detail. To begin with, we will analyze the problem with three rods from the point of view of the Poincare Theory of Relativity.

As in the example with the "Twin paradox", we have two variants.

"Classic" when the reference system to binded to the "Absolute reference system", or simply called a "fixed" frame of reference.

And the "general case" when the problem is considered with respect to the "moving" frame of reference. On the one hand, Einstein insisted that he did not have an Absolute frame of reference, like Poincare, and that Einstein had all the systems on an equal footing. But when Einstein chose the "resting" system , and ascribes to it real laws, then in all other "moving" systems except real sizes and real time, virtual sizes and virtual time appear. Thus, "Einstein systems" are the same Poincare systems. "Independence of systems" -this is an empty word and Einstein’s attempt to hide his plagiarism.

First, consider the classic case where the “resting” reference system does not move (it stands like a ship on a lake). We have three identical rods (AB), (A1-B1) and (A2-B2). The rod (AB) does not move in our "resting" classical system, and the rods (A1-B1) and (A2-B2) move at the same speed relative to our system, and towards each other.

Suppose that all the left ends of the three rods coincide, that is, at one point at the same time, there were three left ends A, A1 and A2. What will be on the right? The rods (A1-B1) and (A2-B2) move at the same speed, that is, they have decreased equally, and they are smaller than the rod (AB).

That is, the ends B1 and B2 will be at the right at one point, and further to the right, end B. That is, the rods (A1-B1) and (A2-B2) will be the same and will be inside the rod (AB).

Now consider the general case. Suppose that a “resting” system moves to the right relative to another resting system.In our "moving-resting" system lies the rod (AB), and the same rods (A1-B1) and (A2-B2) we again launched at the same speed relative to the rod (AB), and towards each other.. The rod (A1-B1) we also let fly to the right, and the rod (A2-B2) then moves to the left. When all three left ends-A, A1 and A2, coincide at one point, then to the right of them will be a completely different picture than it was in in the classical case. Since the rod (A1-B1) also moves to the right, its speed relative to the first resting system is greater than the speed of the “resting” rod (AB), that is, with the rod (A1-B1) is initially physically smaller than the rod (AB), on the other hand, the speed of the rod (A2-B2) relative to the "first resting system" is less than the speed of the rod (AB), that is, the rod (A2-B2) is larger than the rod (AB) .That is, on the right, it will go first end of B1, further to the right end of B and then B2.

In our “resting-moving” reference frame, the clock hands at point B are shifted backward and show less time than the clock hands at point A. The clock hands at the point where ends B1 and B2 are located also show less time than time at point A , (A1 and A2). Assume that at the moment when points A, A1 and A2 coincide, the clock at point A shows "0", further suppose that at this "moment" the clock is at points (we go from left to right), at B1 show - “minus 5 (seconds)” at point B - “minus 10 (sec.)” And at point B2- “minus 15". After points A, A1 and A2 coincided, the rods continue to move,points B1 and B2 move towards each other and meet at some point P at the time when the clock at point P showed “0.” The distance between point A and point P is the length of the rods (A1-B1) and (A2-B2) measured in the reference frame where the rod (AB) is resting. Point P is between points A and B, that is, from the point of view of the "moving" system in which the rod (AB) is resting, the rods (A1-B1) and (A2 -B2) decreased and became smaller than the rod (AB), and so the rods (A1-B1) and (A2-B2) decreased equally and are equal to each other. In the general case, the following happened. The rod (A1-B1) was initially smaller more than the rod (AB), but as a result of measurements, the rod (A1-B1) “grew a bit”, as it continued to move to point P after the ends-A, A1 and A2 met. Rod (A2-B2) was initially larger rod (AB), but measurements showed that the rod (A2-B2) is smaller than the rod (AB), since the rod (A2-B2), like the rod (A1-B1), only in the opposite direction, continued to move to the point P after the ends-A, A1 and A2 met. Point P, the meeting of two rods, is at the same distance from point A, as it was in the first classical, “fixed” case. Thus m, from the point of view of a moving system, everything happened exactly the same as in a fixed system. But this "equality" of systems is formal. In reality, the rod (A1-B1) remained smaller than the rod (AB) than our measurements, and the rod (A2-B2), in reality, remained larger than the rod (AB), although it “formally” became smaller.

Now back to the “Ladder paradox” .We, as described above, have two options: “General” and “classic.” In "general" case, based on the above example, we don’t know whether the flying ladder is “shorter” or “longer” than the garage.

That is, the “formally” moving ladder will indeed be smaller than the garage, but physically it will be either or longer or shorter. Therefore, I will not consider the general case, although in practice we always deal with the “general” case and we do not correctly conclude that in the first part of the paradox, the staircase will certainly fit in the barn.

The "classical" case, in fact, presupposes an absolute motionless reference system, according to which any moving body, according to the point of view accepted in science, will certainly be smaller. Modern physics considers just the classical case everywhere, and there are still disputes and there is no clear and understandable explanation for the process. Therefore, we will analyze only the well-known "classical" case, although physically it is unrealistic, since we do not know anything about the absolute reference frame. But any analysis is useful for theory

So, we have a “resting” garage with two opposite doors and a ladder equal in length to it. When the ladder flies, it shrinks and completely fits into the garage and the garage doors are closed at the same time, according to the clock installed on its doors. According to the theory of relativity, At the same time, a clock is placed on the flying ladder, and here, as explained earlier, the “inequality” of reference systems already begins,since the clock on the ladder shows one time (the difference between the clock hands) and the pendulums show another time. In the garage system, the clocks and pendulums show the same time. The clock synchronization on the ladder takes place taking into account the fact that the ladder is moving and that before that the garage clock has been synchronized, taking into account that the garage is at rest.

So, from the Garage's point of view, the ladder flies to the right, and when the ladder is inside the Garage, the clock on the right end of the ladder shows less time than on the left end of the ladder . Now we will consider the situation from the perspective of the ladder . Clock synchronization on the ladder is maintained, and clock readings correspond to the events that occurred. It is believed that synchronizing the clock on the ladder is an internal independent process, although in practice we took into account the speed of the ladder relative to the Garage (there are nuances that are not directly related to the paradox.In reality,clock hands do not depend on from which system do we look at them,from this depends only, how we calculate the speed of the system). If the ladder fit in the garage in the first case, then it should be fully fit in the garage and in the second case.

And so it goes if you take into account that the clock on the ladder does not reflect the real time of the ladder. Now the Garage, when viewed from the point of view of the ladder , flies on it "from right to left" (if you look, as in the first case, from the bottom), and "from left to right" , if you look from the point of view of the stairs, "from above." Let's see "from above."

Then, on the stairs clock “left”, the arrows show less time than “right”, and the Garage also flies “left to right”.

When the garage fully accommodates the ladder , the clock hands on the left end of the ladder show time less than the arrows on the right, this is the time that allows us to estimate the real dimensions of the “flying” Garage. But being on the ladder, we don't know how fast it is moving, and therefore we don't know what clocks fix the real dimensions of the moving body, therefore we are forced to use the distance between the clocks showing the same time to determine the size.

So, when the Flying Barn has completely placed the ladder, then on the ladder 's clock “left”, the arrows show less time than “right”, we denote this as 5 seconds to the left, and 6 seconds to the right.

It is possible that the Observer on the ladder can physically recognize that the ladder is completely in the garage, for this Poincare called for further experiments and evaluations. But formally, the observer on the ladder assesses his condition using the clock of the ladder.

The observer on the ladder records that the clock on the right showed 6 seconds. and waits for the "left" end of the garage to fly over the clock,

showing 6 seconds. The left end of the shed flew past the left end of the ladder in 5 seconds and continues to move to the point where the clock shows 6 seconds. This point is inside the ladder, so from the point of view of the ladder, the garage was smaller, although in reality the garage is larger than the ladder .

So, the "Ladder Paradox" is easily solved if we take into account which dimensions are real and which are virtual.

From the physical "equality of systems" introduced by Einstein, "Machismos," it follows that either the contractions are equally real everywhere, or the contractions are all the same "seeming." With this setting, the paradoxes that arise are no longer paradoxes, but insoluble contradictions.

Einstein did not want to admit that in one case the size reductions are real, and in the opposite case, virtual, since this cancels the "equality of systems" and turns the "Einstein's Theory of Relativity" into the "Poincare principle of relativity".

Therefore, in the framework of Einstein's Theory of Relativity, the "Ladder Paradox", as well as the "Twin paradox" has no decision , and from the moment the so-called "Einstein's Theory of Relativity" arose, scientific solutions to the "paradoxes" was not given.

In the framework of the real "Poincaré theory of relativity," these paradoxes do not exist at all.

888 Chief Soviet dissident888, chief physicist and mathematician: - Henrich Leonidovich Arutyunov. (Not rehabilitated)

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