

# Re: Evil Twin Paradox

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-08/msg00696.html>

---

- *From:* Alen <[alen1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:alen1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 08 Aug 2007 06:36:57 -0700
- 

On Aug 8, 6:16 pm, "harry" <[harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

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

[news:1186550065.354550.68060@xx](mailto:news:1186550065.354550.68060@xx)

On Aug 8, 1:12 am, "harry" <[harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx](mailto:harald.vanlintelButNotT...@xxxxxxx)> wrote:

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

[news:1186495493.751336.301890@xx](mailto:news:1186495493.751336.301890@xx)

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

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

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

[...]

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

## Re: Evil Twin Paradox

Minkowski diagrams are calculation aids. Many physicists simply want to calculate and have stopped trying to make sense of things, and tend to take things at face-value. For example Feynman even claimed: "I hope you can accept Nature as she is – absurd."

If, indeed, physics has taken a wrong turn somewhere, such a situation would be inevitable.

It's not necessarily a wrong turn to use models that work but don't make sense – it's surely better than no model!  
Of course, when I have the choice between a model that makes sense to me and one that makes no sense to me at all, the choice is clear.

It should therefore be taken to be a symptom of the existence of at least one erroneous concept. I have identified the physical reality of Minkowski spacetime as an erroneous concept, though I no longer expect anyone who still adheres to it to be flexible enough to question it. Until erroneous concepts are eliminated, however, physics must continue to be paradoxical in respect of such a concept.

If spacetime rotations are not supposed to be physically real, then arbitrary fulcra of rotations can be used as desired.

No, the rotation is determined by the Lorentz factor (and thus by the speed).  
Minkowski diagrams provide a handy graphical means to directly match clock

Re: Evil Twin Paradox

readings and distances of one inertial coordinate system with those of another inertial system that moves relative to it (note that neither system rotates!).

[...]

Regards,  
Harald

Of course it is determined by the speed. I have never questioned that. My question concerns the FULCRUM of the spacetime rotation.

OK, the point of rotation. That is conveniently done around the origin for convenience. As <http://origins.colorado.edu/~ajsh/sr/hypercubel.html> puts it, a spacetime rotation is a Lorentz transformation.

But now you apparently say, like I do, that there is no real, physical spacetime rotation!? Do you accept, therefore, that length contraction requires a different physical explanation than that of a spacetime rotation?

Sure – assuming that with "physical" you mean the question of what may be "really" happening.

Perhaps if you were to acknowledge that it does, you would become a 'crackpot' and destroy your reputation?

Even allowing that Minkowski spacetime is only a 'handy graphical means' must be very dangerous for you, unless you have the reputation of a 'crackpot' or 'crank' already, like I have.

Scientists do accept different opinions about hidden reality and rarely do

## Re: Evil Twin Paradox

name-calling. For example Mach didn't believe in atoms.

Or is it the case that, secretly, numbers of physicists really know that there is no real Minkowski spacetime, but are not able to admit it publicly?

As it belongs to philosophy, the question of "real" is rarely discussed among physicists. "Shut up and calculate!" :-)

Harald

On the whole, a rarely revealing answer, I think. You manage to admit much on behalf of physicists, without being categorical about anything in particular.

But, again, on the whole, a sad reflection on the quality of the science of physics at the present time.

Alen

.