

Re: The real twin paradox.

## Re: The real twin paradox.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-11/msg01480.html>

---

- *From:* "kenseto" <kenseto@xxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 22 Nov 2007 10:23:44 -0500
- 

"bz" <bz+spr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
<news:Xns99EFC6EC6C39FWQAHBGMXSZHVspammote@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

"Sue..." <suzysewnshow@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in  
<news:75645b9d-5e0d-4d6d-8793-6a916df243dd@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

"normal" clocks are usually inertial mechanisms. Are you disputing this statement with your suggestion that a light-clock should behave the same way as an inertial clock ?

I am not talking about light clocks at all.  
I still don't know about them. KS keeps telling me that the first photons miss the mirrors.

Yes.....due to the absolute motion of the mirror wrt the light ray.

KS, HW and Sue keep telling me that "normal clocks" don't lose ticks, no matter how far and fast they go.

Wong I didn't say that at all. I said that a clock second for a moving clock contains a larger amount of absolute time. This corresponds to the SR assertion that the rate on the moving clock is running slow compared to the observer's clock.

I don't know who to believe, KS, HW and Sue or the evidence.

Believe the evidence.....that a moving clock second contains a larger amount of absolute time.

Re: The real twin paradox.

Re: The real twin paradox.

I would love to see data that falsifies GR, but I don't expect to see it soon or here.

But that is not my goal at the mome