

Re: The Real TWINS Paradox – the Simplest Version

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007–10/msg01062.html>

- *From:* Phil <toob-headman@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 19 Oct 2007 17:03:40 GMT
-

Sue... wrote:

Well, this time I am mostly impressed! You still referred to "other references," instead of reasoning it out for yourself, but I was fairly harsh, and you responded with pure class ... the Sue I am used to seeing!

Thanks,
Phil

P.S. The universe does allow an experiment to "reveal" to us that information about our "absolute velocity" which we could simply deduce on our own, PRIOR to running the experiment. If we KNOW, prior to running an experiment, that the experiment's velocity will include a change of $0.6c$ relative to inertial observer C, as seen by inertial observer C, then it would actually be amazing if the results of that experiment were NOT consistent with a change of $0.6c$, such as an elapsed time of 0.8 relative to any inertial observer.

Similarly, simple geometry PROVES that if observer A goes on a round trip with a constant velocity of $0.6c$ relative to inertial observer C (the clock paradox), then A's AVERAGE absolute velocity is also at least $0.6c$, meaning that A's clocks should show an elapsed time of 0.8 relative to C. However, we cannot deduce, prior to the experiment, anything about C's absolute velocity of $0.6c$, so unless the principle of relativity is false, then as seen by C, A must ALWAYS end up with an elapsed time of exactly 0.8 , regardless of C's absolute velocity, and that is in fact the case. Remember, relativity does not disprove absolute velocity; the conclusion has been that absolute velocity should be eliminated from physics because it is irrelevant, not because relativity has somehow proven that absolute velocity doesn't exist. Alen's exercise is an indication that this largely PHILOSOPHICAL conclusion may not be completely justified, even though the exercise in no way contradicts the LAWS of SR.

My (unpublished) paper is "The Need for Absolute References in a Relativistic Universe," and its point is largely summed up in this exercise; if it NECESSARILY FOLLOWS from OBSERVATIONS that some laws are in fact functions of absolute velocity, then the fact that experimental results are independent of initial absolute velocity does not mean that we should declare that there are no "absolutes," no absolute laws, in our universe. It's basically similar to dinosaurs; can we find any? No, but their existence necessarily follows from things that CAN be directly