Re: Twin paradox revisited ll

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007−07/msg02630.html

- *From*: "Jeckyl" <noone@xxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Tue, 24 Jul 2007 11:21:23 +1000

"bill" <cosmosco@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1185235954.440484.53780@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> On Jul 22, 10:26 pm, "Martin Hogbin" <goatREMOVETHIS...@xxxxxxxxxx>
> wrote:
>
> > "bill" <cosmo...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in
> > messagenews:1184981064.527191.20310@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
> >
> > > On Jul 20, 7:11 pm, "Martin Hogbin"
> > > <goatREMOVETHIS...@xxxxxxxxxx>
> > > wrote:
> >
> > > No I would not. I cannot accept that the traveler *really*
> > > believes
> > > that the earth is orbiting the sun at around 1m−s nor do I
> > > believe
> > > that this is what would 'really' be happening.
> >
> > This is the crux of the problem. The problem we have is that the
> > English language has evolved to describe things we see in
> > normal life. It turns out that, when high speeds are involved,
> > things are very different and we do not have words to adequately
> > describe what happens. Thus, is the current context, words
> > like 'really' and 'physically' do not have any useful meaning.
>
> In everyday life, if I say something 'really' or 'physically'
> happens, there is no need to explain what I mean; everybody
> knows.
>
> So, what can we do to come to any form of agreement?
>
> Firstly, we can state the facts that are undisputed and
> explicable without ambiguity in the English language. For
> example, we agree that on his return, the traveller has
> aged less then the inertial twin. We can also agree that

in the inertial frame of any twin nothing unusual happens.

Secondly, we can state what we expect the results of any measurement will b