

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

D: Time / Error No. 9

Paul Langevin and Albert Einstein claim that a twin returning from a [space] journey will be younger than his twin brother who had remained on the earth

This claim is designated by the relativists as the "twins paradox". It originated in the first years after 1905. - The basis had been provided by Albert Einstein (AE 1905) with the claim that time dilation is a real effect (p. 904) and that the clock travelling in a polygonal curve, on its return to the starting point is running behind the clock that remained there (cf. Error D 6).

Paul Langevin is said to be the first to have had the idea of substituting the clocks with two twin brothers, one of whom shoots off in a space capsule and then returns, to discover that he is now younger than his twin brother.

In his lecture in Zurich in 1911 Albert Einstein explicitly adopts this idea of transfer to living beings (S. 12): "If, for example, we were to put a living organism in a box and then send it on the same outbound and return journeys as the clocks previously, one could see to it, after as long a flight as required, that this organism returned little altered to its starting point, whereas absolutely comparable organisms that had remained at the original location would long since have given way to new generations." "This is an irrefutable consequence of the underlying principles that experience has forced us to accept."

To clearly bring out the logic, experience forces us to accept the principles, and the principles demand irrefutably that one remains young.

At the outset of the era of space travel E. Sänger, working on this basis, made fantastic - but precise - calculations on the staying young of the travelling twin.

A glance at the academic textbooks of physics shows that, for students and already even for final-year schoolchildren, such calculations meanwhile belong to the standard exercises. - Since all of Albert Einstein's deductions on non-simultaneity and time dilation have been proven incorrect (cf. Errors D 1 - D 8), one need not seriously discuss any farther-reaching fantasies derived therefrom - unless one wishes to complete an academic course of studies in physics, or to be successful in one's final, school-leaving examinations.

At this point a simple misunderstanding can be cleared up. Some critics quote the lecture by Albert Einstein in 1911 with the statement that he merely wanted to "shake" the box with the living beings. The reason for this can only be Einstein's formulation "outbound and return journeys [i.e. back and forth motion]", by which he was indeed referring, however, to the outbound and return journeys of arbitrary length.

The twins error is treated by the relativists as the "twins paradox", because paradoxes are somehow a bit more distinguished, and one can assure the amazed public that the seeming absurdity may not make sense at a first glance, but it is exactly in this point that the greatness of the theory and its author can be seen, that he can explain the nonsensical effect quite simply and naturally! Sound common sense, however, must not be allowed to interfere in the process.

In their formulations, with which they introduce the "twins paradox" to their public, the relativists do not shy away from initially conceding, engagingly though in drastic words, the unusual and nonsensical and experience-contradictory aspects of their "twins paradox", whereby they naturally win the readers over in that they make them (the readers) confident that, despite all dubiousness, things will end well. In the end,

however, things regularly wind up in a situation in which the reader should believe it mostly because it has been mathematically proven. In 1911 Albert Einstein said to his listeners that we are forced (!) to accept this from the principles, which are derived from experience. The physicists have no other choice. Max Born, referring to his explanation of time dilation with the world lines of Minkowski, says simply and honestly: "One has to accept it." Decided and announced. All further argumentation to be discontinued. That's how they would like to have it.

It should be noticed that people who regard themselves as physicists manage, within the framework of a theory that is openly said to be only applicable to constant rectilinear motion, to select as examples of this theory, processes which involve non-constant motion. This is scientific physics - since 1911 at the latest.

When the same people attempt to explain the processes conceived by them, they are surprised to discover that non-constant motion appears, and come to the conclusion that the matter has to be explained in the context of another theory on irregular motion. Or they maintain that this irregular motion is unimportant.

Anyone who allows himself such blunders really ought to eliminate the conceived problem as quickly as possible from the theory applied to constant rectilinear motion. This is an option that the physicists of the world of relativity have failed to hit on so far, probably because "Einstein has (not) taught us".

AE 1905. - Langevin, Paul: L'évolution de l'espace et du temps. In: Scientia. 10. 1911, f. 3, pp 31- 54. - Einstein, Albert: Die Relativitätstheorie. In: Naturforschende Gesellschaft in Zürich. Quarterly. 56. 1911, H. 1/2, pp 1-14. - Born, Max: Die Relativitätstheorie Einsteins. Unaltered reprint of the 5th edition. Berlin 1969. 328 pages (Heidelberger Taschenbücher. 1.) 1st edition 1920. - Marder, Leslie: Reisen durch die Raum-Zeit; das Zwillingsparadoxon - Geschichte einer Kontroverse. Braunschweig etc.: Vieweg, 1979. 169 pages.