

## Re: Twin paradox revisited II

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-07/msg03221.html>

---

- *From:* "Jeckyl" <noone@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Mon, 30 Jul 2007 14:20:37 +1000
- 

"bill" <cosmosco@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
<news:1185767620.803614.134200@xx>

You are missing the point of my original posting which was that in the correspondence 10 years ago and now in Mike's posting the traveler determines that his twin appears to be aging at a slower rate than he is thus he concludes that this is *\*physically, meaningfully, really\** taking place;

It is

that as Mike points out – when the traveler accelerates during his return trip his sister's aging rate is *\*reversed\**.

In accordance with that concept – the traveler truly believes that during his period of acceleration the earth is *\*physically\** spinning backwards and is orbiting the sun in the opposite direction;

I don't think time actually goes backwards at any point .. I've not seen that predicted by any of the explanations. It would not make sense, as time for the earth is supposed to be FASTER from the non-inertial frame of the traveller .. not backward.

[snip objections to something that I don't believe is predicted]

One response to this discussion was that the traveler's actions – his direction or rate of travel and his pressure upon, or release of, the gas pedal – can have *\*no\** physical effect on the earth or his sister or on every galaxy in the entire universe and I tend to agree.

Any 'law' that insists otherwise is asinine.

If its what happens, then what you think about it makes no difference. You cannot appeal a law of nature

## Re: Twin paradox revisited II

The traveler is sitting in his ship on the launch pad. He hears the command 'ignition'. He sees voluminous clouds of smoke and flames and feels himself being pushed back into his seat. He continues to accelerate and, as he does so, he sees, out his front window, that section of the universe \*appearing\* to accelerate toward him and, via his rear-view mirror, the rest of the universe, including the earth, \*appearing\* to accelerate away from him.

What he thinks doesn't matter

He takes his foot off the gas pedal and at that very instant, according to some posters, he is of the opinion that he is no longer moving but that he is at rest and it is the universe that is moving past him!

That's correct .. both views are equally correct. And note that how much of the universe is moving past him, how much he is stationary relative to and how much is moving away is another question. All that has happened is that there are different proportions for each

In the nanosecond prior to his taking his foot off the gas pedal he sees what had appeared, prior to take off, a seemingly 'fixed' firmament \*appearing\* to be flashing past him at close to the speed of light and although he \*knows\*, having experienced a tremendous force of acceleration during take off, that prior to removing his foot from the gas pedal \*he\* was moving

No .. he knows he was ACCERLATING. That means there was a change in how much he was moving. But whetehr or not he ends up in a state of movment in some particular direction, he cannot tell. It all depends on what frame of reference you use for deciding what is 'stationary'

but a nanosecond later insists that he is \*not\* moving?

He would insist that relative to his own iFoR he is not .. he would insist that relative to the planet he took off from he his. He has any of a infinite number of velocities, depending on how you measure it

In that previous nanosecond he was conducting an internal dynamic experiment which proved, as he suspected, that his was \*not\* an

## Re: Twin paradox revisited II

inertial reference frame – that his ship was in fact accelerating but a fraction of a second later he concludes that, irrespective of that period of acceleration, he has come to a stop?

In his iFoR .. yes

If, as some people suggest, he is of the opinion that he does not start moving following ignition but that it is the earth that is dropping away from him he would be fully justified in screaming that the sky is falling.

He would say that he changed velocity after ignition, and the earth did not. That is all he is justified in saying

Why do some people continue to insist that the traveler cannot apply logic and realise that millions of people are not coming out of the grave?

Because it DOES NOT MATTER what he thinks.

That he does \*not\* possess the power of life over death either for people back on the planet or the stars themselves?

He doesn't

I am of the opinion that this is what they were taught and, in accordance with that 'education' system, have lost, or never possessed, the ability to be able to think for themselves.

That would be you, I gues.

In response to one of my postings a Professor of Physics at a major Asian University wrote that whilst he could not agree with the argument I had put forward at least it had made him \*think\*. What more could one ask?

For you to do some thinking as well .. you are locked into your particular view and are unwilling to look at other points of view.

Your ignoring of posts, from me an others, shows your closed–mindedness on

Re: Twin paradox revisited II

## Re: Twin paradox revisited II

the subject. You ignore those who do not agree with you and then hope to be proved right from a consensus of those who remain.