

Re: Twin Paradox Question

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-12/msg01331.html>

- *From:* "Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 15 Dec 2005 12:43:05 -0800
-

Russell wrote:

> Sue... wrote:

>> Russell wrote:

>>> Sue... wrote:

>>>> Russell wrote:

>>>>> Sue... wrote:

>>>>>> Russell wrote:

>>>>>>> Sue... wrote:

>>>>>>

>>>>>> [snip]

>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> So... what do the Jovian moons appear to both observers

>>>>>>>> while all this hair is growing and greying?

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> On the return trip, the youthful twin sees the moon zooming

>>>>>>>> at high speed around Jupiter. It makes up all of the orbits

>>>>>>>> that failed to be seen on the outbound trip. The total counts

>>>>>>>> come out the same at the moment the twin gets home.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> So if we use Jupiter's moons to measure his reading speed

>>>>>>>> he reads fast departing but slow returning.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> If we use the **received** frequency of the moon's orbit, that is

>>>>>>>> correct. Note, in our usual time coordinates this frequency is

>>>>>>>> Doppler shifted, so just to be clear, let us say explicitly that

>>>>>>>> we make **no** compensation for Doppler.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> We can do

>>>>>>>> the same for rate of hair growth.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Yes indeed.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> You just defeated your own argument.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> How so? Did you do the calculation?

>>>>>>>>> Yeah the planet I was leaving was celebrating one birthday

>>>>>>>>> for every two on the planet I was approaching. The

>>>>>>>>> situation reversed on my return trip so everybody must have

Re: Twin Paradox Question

>>>> had the number of birthdays.
>>>
>> Whoa, stick to your stupid units.
>
> [above sentence was written by me; Sue's quoting is wrong.]
>
>> No...
>> It is too many millimeters close to lunch to do your maths for
>> you.
>
> *My* maths? My maths is as explained in the FAQ, one page
> of which Androcles so kindly posted here, with his oh-so-helpful
> commentary. Everything I said here consistent with that page.
> (Not with the commentary.)
>
> *You* claimed that I defeated my own argument, but when pressed
> to justify this attack, you post a silly caricature of a "calculation"
> that, as I correctly point out, in no way relates to our discussion.
> I press you further and you run away for pizza. Disappointing.
>
> Well, perhaps you will get back to me after lunch. Remember,
> I did not say you *had* to do the calculation to satisfy me — a
> thoughtful reading of the FAQ would suffice.
>
> [snip more lame attempts at cleverness]
>
>> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Noether's_theorem
>
> Noether's theorem is supposed to tell my why I defeated my own
> argument, in your opinion? You are quite a piece of work, Sue.

Noether's theroem tells you what time is.
Then you can go complile a list of corrections for for your FAQ.

Sue...

.

• *References:*

- ◆ *Re: Twin Paradox Question*
◇ *From: Bob*
- ◆ *Re: Twin Paradox Question*
◇ *From: Sue...*
- ◆ *Re: Twin Paradox Question*
◇ *From: Russell*
- ◆ *Re: Twin Paradox Question*
◇ *From: Black Knight*
- ◆ *Re: Twin Paradox Question*
◇ *From: Russell*

- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Sue...*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Russell*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Sue...*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Russell*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Sue...*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Russell*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Sue...*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Russell*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Sue...*
- ◆ **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
 - ◇ *From: Russell*

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Dayton Miller's Data have no Real Signal](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Twin Paradox Question](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**