

Re: The Twin Paradox explained from the moving twin ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2006-09/msg01614.html>

- *From:* "Nicolaas Vroom" <nicolaas.vroom@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 17 Sep 2006 18:34:32 GMT
-

"Dirk Van de moortel" <dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> schreef in bericht [news:O8gPg.81578\\$Eu1.1258558@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:O8gPg.81578$Eu1.1258558@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"Nicolaas Vroom" <nicolaas.vroom@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:9BfPg.81516\\$RS2.1038472@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:9BfPg.81516$RS2.1038472@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

"Dirk Van de moortel"
<dirkvandemoortel@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
schreef in bericht

If you start from A1 you have to add 1 in order to calculate the total time
 $v/(c-v) + 1 = v/(c-v) + (c-v)/(c-v) = (v + c - v)/(c-v) = c/(c-v)$
And that is your answer,
which is correct

And so is my answer.

Yes, but be aware of the fact that your statement
| 1. When the clock of A reaches 1 time unit (t=1), A issues a light
| signal to B.
explicitly means that you start with [A0], not with [A1].

Your method is more general

I wouldn't say more general.
It's just standard basic 2D analytic geometry.
And so is your method. We just take different origins.

Re: The Twin Paradox explained from the moving twin ?

I fully agree.
All problems solved
And they lived happily thereafter.
Unfortunate it is not tea time anymore but coffee time

And I have still to answer Paul B Andersen.

Nicolaas Vroom
<http://users.pandora.be/nicvroom/>