

INVITATION TO SEARCH OF THE TRUTH ON EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIVITY THEORY

- **1. It is not necessary to take unconditionally on trust sweeping charges of relativists in incompetence of critics of the relativity theory;**

This first label which relativists hang up on the opponents, does not correspond to the facts. Many known philosophers and physicists (including winners of the Nobel Prize) belonged to the critics of the relativity theory. Among the most well-known opponents of the RT, understanding its limitation and arguing against it interpretations, the following opponents were: philosophers: A.Bergson, A.F.Losev, E.Mah and many other ones; Nobel winners: H.Lorentz, J.J.Thomson, Ph.von Lennard, A.A.Michelson, V.Wien, V.Ostwald, A.Gullstrand, F.Soddy, J.Stark, E.M.McMillan, H.Yukawa, H.Alfven (criticising, basically, modern cosmology, being one of the strict ! consequences of the general relativity theory; in brackets also we will notice, what even P.A.M.Dirac seriously considered that the world constants depend on time, but this hypothesis is not entered in any way in the RT without change of its bases); the famous physicists and mathematicians: A.Poincare, V.Ritz, M.Abragam, N.E.Zhukovsky, Krylov A.N., K.E.Tsiolkovsky, G.Ives (the experiment of which relativists have attributed in the own "coin box"), L.Janoshshi, G.Izrael, R.Tomashek, L.Essen, L.Brillouin, G.Dingl, N.Tesla, J.Larmour, J.Bernal, S.A.Chaplygin and many hundreds other known physicists (it is far not the full list of opponents of the RT, numbering not one thousand experts, is resulted in the present Library separately). Taking into account the fact that the number of the "well-known" supporters of the RT was the same order, and the majority of physicists simply prefers "not communicate" with this "muddy water", to solve a problem of check of the RT by comparison "at whom a back more widely, the stomach is more or cheeks is inflated", being guided by pressure of relativistic self-advertisement, it will not be possible. Thus, for a question of the validity or falsity of the relativity theory the labels hung by relativists on opponents, have no value.

- **2. Specialisation of opponents also has no relation to a question on the validity or falsity of the relativity theory;**

Similar hints on specialisation pursue some the dark purposes: 1) remind that who though somehow worked with relativistic subjects, that they "are tied by one string", and 2) indirectly to accuse opponents of a superficial acquaintance with relativistic subjects. However relativists have "miscalculated". First, work within the limits of a private relativistic model does not assume responsibility of the researcher for all relativistic subjects (simply, the majority used formulas, without the oath to relativistic interpretations). Secondly, there is nothing terrible or shameful in inadvertent errors (and, especially, in their recognition). Thirdly, even allocation of physics from natural sciences has occurred rather recently, not to mention artificial smashing to narrower specialisations (it is possible, too for "the necessary" control "from above" and predicted movement in "track"). Fourthly, for some reason, relativists forget about the "basic" requirements to specialisation when articles are written to protection of the relativity theory. At last, fifthly, really at the beginning it is necessary to "walk smack" in "something", that then it would be possible to criticise it from

"within"? What then means concept "qualification" for the physicist? Thus, for a question of the validity or falsity of the relativity theory the specialisation of authors too has no value.

- **3. The statement as if "you not so understand this or that moment of the relativity theory" means only that the given relativist did not read works of other relativists;**

It is the most surprising phenomenon in the process of formation of the RT: relativists often do not know not only works of opponents, but also interpretations of the relativity theory by the others known relativists. And when know, at them something operates like "mutual responsibility": they never argue with each other in spite of the fact that often statements of the one relativist completely contradict works of the another relativist. Apparently, many of them have come to a science for self-affirmation, instead of from children's pure prompting "to learn True and to touch to Eternal". Thus, the attentive analysis of the relativity theory will help you to draw independent conclusions, instead of to listen learnt by rote stranger "domestic preparations" (codings).

- **4. It is not necessary to have a sensation of depression by A.Einstein's authority;**

First, our reverence for A.Einstein developed from children's hobby for a science fiction, under the influence of advertising and laudatory statements in mass media and his name mentions in all physical textbooks. Though many physicists did not read its any work and did not check them on presence of elementary logic and mathematical errors and the physical non-consistency. Without speaking about, that to know its other qualities (why, for example, there were coded early his letters?) . Secondly, the feeling of depression before authorities can become a conformism harbinger, that is fear "as though someone another has not expressed my discrepancy of the degree, the post or to the rank" (recollect a fairy tale "Naked king"). Even if A.Einstein would be "three times the Nobel prize winner, twice the president of the Earth or the master of a thunder", all it would not have any relation to a question on the validity or falsity of the relativity theory and possibility of the unbiased analysis of the given theory.

- **5. The Nobel Prize has been awarded by A.Einstein not for the relativity theory;**

The canard with the award on many operates as "red tags". Actually the Nobel Prize (for 1921) has been awarded by A.Einstein for the explanation of two laws of photoeffect (named sometimes the second law of photoeffect) on the basis of his formula, that is, on-essence, for support of quantum ideas of M.Planck (the photoeffect has been before opened by G.Hertz); the considerable contribution in photoeffect researches has brought A.G.Stoletov to whom one more law of photoeffect (named sometimes by the first law of photoeffect) has been earlier explained. At S.Arrenius' announcement (in 1922) about award of the Prize to A.Einstein, it has been told that the Prize to it has awarded despite doubtfulness of its other theories and presence of serious objections to them (that is with a gentleman's hint that it is not necessary to mention them in the Nobel lecture). Despite it, all have been surprised, when A.Einstein as the Nobel lecture (which has taken place in 1923 only) again propagandised the theories. But in any case, the Nobel Prize does not guarantee "sanctity of all ideas" their owner and indestructibility forever all its theories.

Thus, the given moment should not stop researchers in carrying out of the unbiased analysis of the theory in any way.

- **6. It is not necessary to pay attention to political charges from relativists in anti-Semitism at all;**

It is absolutely unscientific "argument" which does not have to a question on eternal True any relation. (Really if Martin Bormann has told, what "twice two is equal to four", then "pseudo-defender" of the relativity theory would necessarily be impatient to tell, what "twice two will be five"? So at whom does not "in an order" with his head? Apparently, at both; the truth, in different spheres of activity.) Certainly, in our country rich with the cultural traditions, this type of an attack is less extended, than in the USA. But, unfortunately, some people do not understand that "rushing a dirt in others" (that is translating a question on the person), it is impossible most to remain pure. For this reason the science should not be connected with a policy (and similar stir up one groups of people against other people under cover ostensibly "the ethical" moments it is simply inadmissible). Though some authors really suffer incorrect statements, but, fortunately, natural sciences (mathematics and partially physics) are objective, that is verifiable. Hence they do not depend on will of any people, states, governments, desires and opinions of clans, parties, political, religious or culinary predilections of this or that author etc. Therefore the True all the same will triumph sooner or later and it is better to side strategically "Eternal", than the tactical party of a conjuncture. Thus, in a similar direction it is better to be discharged of disputes at once as political "arguments" do not concern scientific True.

- **7. Do not trust, as if critics of the relativity theory reject any observable effects;**

Against what approach we express it is most easier to understand on the following example. Imagine that the sorcerer conjures about sunrise. We do not speak, as if we will not see sunrise; we only assert that spells of the sorcerer have no relation to this rising. The relativity theory is spells of the sorcerer which do not concern at all those effects which explanation is attributed to itself by the relativity theory. Thus, there are no reasons to reject possibility of own analysis of the given theory and to search for the real reasons and concrete mechanisms of the phenomena.

- **8. Be in earnest about the problems which have been found out by opponents in the relativity theory;**

It is elementary to understand the necessity of more careful consideration for criticism on the famous example of the Great Fermat's theorem. Hundred thousand proved cases for different exponents n and millions checked up x , y , z within 350 years did not prove this theorem, but if somebody has casually found out the unique counter-example, the theorem would be denied. That is infinite (!) number of acknowledgement cannot move even one refutation. That is why it is necessary to think for relativists over those contradictions which were found out by opponents, instead of to compete in number of cases where contradictions are purposely hidden by them. The search of the True always assumes the serious relation to objections of opponents.

- **9. There are some various ways for interpretation of any phenomenon or experiment always;**

However not all ways will be physically correct (many ones simply appear mathematical sophistry or adjustment). Each theory (for example, the relativity theory) tries to attribute to itself unique the exclusive right to "explain" (more precisely to interpret) the experimental data. In the history of physics interpretations of the various phenomena constantly varied and it is not necessary to think, as if the last century was the last in these changes. The mankind is in the beginning of the Way of Knowledge, than in its end (who thinks differently - never simply looked at the night star sky) more likely. Thus, be not afraid to analyze ostensibly relativistic experiments and independently to search for the most natural interpretation of the phenomena.

- **10. Logically inconsistent theory cannot be considered as scientific at all;**

Logic, as a common sense part (all the rest is called, by definition, nonsense) - is more than any private theory. All Science is based on the logic. And if in the private theory (what, for example, the relativity theory is) logical, mathematical or physical contradictions are found out, it is necessary to refuse such theory. Any theory cannot be in this moment an exception. The relativity theory too cannot remain "untouchable" for the logical constructive analysis.

- **11. Do not consider that the worst arguments (purposely chosen by relativists) is all arguments against the relativity theory;**

Absurdities of the relativity theory are appreciable enough. It generates aspiration even at nonprofessionals to write about it, that no means always it turns out strictly from the scientific point of sight. Besides, unfortunately, "mad ideas" come to mind of not only relativists, but also to their some opponents. Here the main thing is the following: "together with water not to splash out the child". Then any expert can separate reasonable arguments from unreasonable ones and, in case of need, to add them in interests of the True. The desire would be independent to understand the question.

- **12. Do not consider that "if the relativity theory was incorrect, it would be recognised for a long time";**

Nonrelativistic movement existed parallel to the relativity theory from the moment of its occurrence, but here, unfortunately, the available state of affairs has developed not as a result of scientific dispute, but in summary of political usurpation of the power by relativists. They have reached it with different methods: from indistinct definition of own concepts (or absence of definitions) before falsification of ideas, methods and results of opponents; from "purchase" of physicists and their derivation by other problems before closing of possibility of the publication or access to library materials; from watering by a dirt of the opponents (it is frequent in anonymous lampoons) to physical methods of influence; from introduction of dummy "critics" before method use "to head and discredit". Relativists do not listen the critical remarks to the relativity theory at all and do not read works of the opponents, preferring "to cook in own juice". They have purposefully created

a myth that there are many confirming experiments at the relativity theory, and the logic of their reasonings is ostensibly consistent. One academician has even compared the relativity theory to the multiplication table. Apparently, if someone has written frank bosh and has placed the multiplication table between paragraphs, the given academician would urge all to check up "calculations" and to support "theory". Actually rare examples of their "defence" are constructed by a principle of "the army charter of a joke": Point 1. The relativistic doctrine - is unique the true. Point 2. Do all procedures strictly on the ordered relativistic algorithms and do not set "superfluous" questions. The note. If there are any complexities with relativistic interpretation, urgently compose other scheme, more safe for the relativity theory and in something reminding former one only. Point 3. Read Point 1 at first.

Thus, it is not necessary to hope that "any uncle" from the "political-scientific elite" recognises an inaccuracy of the relativity theory. All depends personally on you. We do not urge all to be as Giordano Bruno. Simply make an own choice even if about it you admit to nobody aloud. Kind to you a way to True search! It that precisely has sense in human activity.

[Return on the main page of the library](#)