

# Re: Evil Twin Paradox

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-08/msg00627.html>

---

- *From:* Alen <[alen1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:alen1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 07 Aug 2007 07:04:53 -0700
- 

On Aug 7, 5:41 pm, "harry" <[harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

"Alen" <[al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message

[news:1186461484.047250.40000@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:1186461484.047250.40000@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Instead of giving my usual argument, I will point to a problem with their explanation that they never deal with. They say that the wall rotates in spacetime,

That's mathematical language. I suspect that a majority of physicists doesn't believe in a geometrical kind of ether in which space is literally mingled with time.

Then what do they believe? Do you agree with me that Minkowski spacetime is not an actual, physical reality?

so that it is almost at 'right angles' to the moving twin, so that the gap looks to be almost completely closed, and thus the moving twin has no chance to fire through such a narrow gap. But a question is, what is the fulcrum of such a rotation, and how is it specified or identified? If anyone says it is specified by the twin who accelerates,

No, it's specified by the set of inertial frames.

Harald

If spacetime rotations are not supposed to be physically real, then arbitrary fulcra of rotations

## Re: Evil Twin Paradox

can be used as desired. If, however, they are supposed to be real, how does an inertial frame establish the location of the fulcrum of its spacetime rotation relative to another inertial frame, if it is not specified by an object that accelerates into it?

Alen

.