

# Re: The Real TWINS Paradox – the Simplest Version

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007–10/msg01026.html>

---

- *From:* Phil <[toob-headman@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:toob-headman@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 18 Oct 2007 23:55:43 GMT
- 

Sue... wrote:

On Oct 17, 10:37 pm, Alen <[al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:al...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

## THE REAL TWINS PARADOX – The Simplest Version

Let it be supposed, in the following scenario, that 'acceleration' is able to be accomplished in a manner, perhaps on some electromagnetic basis, that applies an identical accelerating force to every particle in an observer's reality, including himself, his vehicle, and all his instruments, thus eliminating any detectable gravitational effect of acceleration by the accelerated observer.

You have no evidence that would be the result of such an acceleration.

Try"

"Creative Writing/Fiction technique"

[http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Creative\\_Writing/Fiction\\_technique](http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/Creative_Writing/Fiction_technique)

Sue, I am very dissatisfied in you. I thought you would be honest with yourself, even if that meant having to accept something that at least appears to contradict "The Great Beliefs." Resorting to debate techniques such as, cutting your opponent down to "prove" him wrong is intellectually dishonest, and childish, and I hope I never see you do this again. If someone presents something that cannot immediately be explained, be a TRUE scientist, like Newton or Einstein, take it, examine it, and see if maybe you can USE it to see a little farther into nature, into the truth.

He has no evidence? Please. Simply take a third, inertial observer C, and use the verified laws of SR to determine what the results will be as seen by C. Those will, in fact, be the "true" answers. And as a side note, you get essentially the same situation if you simply knock A and B out with a sleeping pill during the period of acceleration, so we really don't even need the special acceleration device. If A is accelerated, his clocks will

## Re: The Real TWINS Paradox – the Simplest Version

be behind B's clocks when they meet, vice-versa if B is accelerated, and they will have the same time if both are accelerated.

The response a TRUE scientist has is simply this: deal with it. No, that doesn't mean to toss out SR, but it does mean think, reason, try to understand how this could occur, and what it means. Your response, to insult him by telling him to look up "Creative Writing/Fiction technique" is pathetic, and the exact opposite of what a great scientist does. However, it is also normal, the kind of non-scientific response kids are taught at school, so you are simply obeying your training. Still, that particular bit of training is something you need to lose, permanently.

As for what it means, I will mostly let you think about that, and mention only that our ability to view things as being relative, free of any "absolute reference," has always technically applied only to inertial observers, so you really shouldn't be that terrified or whatever when someone whose "absolute velocity" CHANGES has results that cannot be explained when taking ONLY relative velocities into account. Now, does it suggest that claims such as, "absolutes" do not exist at all, or "absolutes" have no place at all in physics, MIGHT BE a bit of an exaggeration? Like I said, act like a TRUE scientist, and THINK about it; conversely, do NOT use debating techniques to act like a politician, and simply justify the act of not thinking about it. Of course, you can always "cut me to shreds," thereby "proving" that everything I've said here is pure crap ... ;-)

Phil

OR

Learn some physics:

<http://farside.ph.utexas.edu/teaching/em/lectures/lectures.html>

<http://web.mit.edu/8.02t/www/802TEAL3D/visualizations/light/index.htm>

<http://www.ee.surrey.ac.uk/Personal/D.Jefferies/antennas.html>

Sue...

[...]