

Re: The real twin paradox.

## Re: The real twin paradox.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-12/msg00026.html>

---

- *From:* bz <bz+spr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 1 Dec 2007 00:29:52 +0000 (UTC)
- 

colp <colp@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in  
<news:caf344e3-e0e0-40dc-a6e3-06c0382cdac9@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>:

On Nov 30, 10:36 pm, bz <bz+...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

colp <c...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote  
<innews:0d8d2519-d996-4397-8506-5fa467cc2aa2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>  
:

That nonsense is the paradox that I am talking about. Facts from one coordinate system do get mixed and matched with facts from other coordinate systems. An example of the is clock synchronisation for GPS satellites.

But the logic and the math are only required to 'appear consistent' under certain sets of circumstances.

I assume that you mean from within a single inertial frame of reference.

Or follow the proper rules when changing frames.

An observer can move between inertial frames, and the logic and math must apply equally in one frame as is does in another.

Follow the proper rules when changing from one to another.  
Daryl showed you the figures.

Re: The real twin paradox.

Re: The real twin paradox.

Your apparent paradox VIOLATES the set of circumstances under which the logic and math are 'required to appear consistent'.

Reality does not require that observations only be made from a particular set of circumstances.

But it does require that you wear the same watch OR you change watches OR you change the watches settings when you change time zones.

Changing direction of travel in your example is much like changing time zones.

You want to keep your watch set the same even though you changed time zones,

AND THEN you complain when you end up missing your appointments and blame the watch.

It isn't the watches fault.

Reality does NOT require that observations only be made from a particular frame of reference, but logic and math requires that you take the fact you have change iFoRs into account.

You refuse to take the change into account and then complain about the results you get.

The fact that things do not appear consistent is thus neither remarkable nor odd nor indicative of a problem in relativity.

It is a problem for relativity because relativity is supposed to describe what happens in reality.

It does, when you follow the rules.

When you break the rules don't expect the results to describe what happens in reality.

It is only indicative of a lack of understanding.

I am 50 miles from a mountain. I am 1/4 mile from a telephone pole. The pole looks taller than the mountain. The mountain is taller than the pole.

Paradox?

Re: The real twin paradox.

Re: The real twin paradox.

Apparently.

No. Not a paradox. A failure to understand perspective.

But if I travel to the mountain (by changing my frame of reference) I notice that the poles appear to get smaller compared to the mountain

It gets bigger! It gets SMALLER when you travel away from the mountain.

and I become aware of perspective effects.

You have to PASS the pole before it gets smaller, in your rear view mirror.

But the mountain looking closer does NOT mean that you have traveled toward it.

You might be looking through a telescope.

You see the mountain as bigger [the pole is bigger too, but you ignore that fact] and then complain about the paradox that the mountain is closer but you haven't moved an inch.

That is exactly the same kind of 'mixing and matching' of facts that you keep doing in order to sustain the illusion that there is a paradox.

Only to those ignorant of perspective, which is based upon light traveling in 'straight lines'.

Are the 'relativity examples' real paradoxes?

If only  $\Delta t = \gamma \Delta t_0$  is applied to the paradox in the OP then the paradox is real because  $\gamma$  is always greater than one.

If you try to drive by looking in the rear view mirror, you will have paradoxes too. You are trying to restrict the tools that can be used.

Why complain when that hammer doesn't do a good job of putting those wood screws into place when there is a perfectly good screw driver sitting right next to the hammer? You can use the hammer to START the screw and then use the screwdriver, or you can predrill the screw hole with a countersink bit.

Re: The real twin paradox.

Re: The real twin paradox.

The wood you are using is really TOO hard for driving in screws with a hammer, yet you persist in banging away and complaining that the hammer is poorly made and the screws are bending and breaking.

You skipped the sudden jump in counts when you jumped from one iFoR to the other. Daryl has pointed it out to you and you ignore it.

Only to those ignorant of  
the temporal perspective views presented by relativistic motion through  
time-space.

So what is it that you think that I am ignorant of?

I begin to think you are feigning.

I am told that I can't 'mix and match' observations which are made  
from different inertial frames of reference. Yet reality does not  
limit observers from changing frames and making conclusions based on  
their observations.

They are free to change frames, as long as they take into account the fact  
that they have 'changed time zones' when they do change frames.  
You continue to refuse to do that.

What joy do you get out of the game you are playing?

--

bz

please pardon my infinite ignorance, the set-of-things-I-do-not-know is an  
infinite set.

bz+spr@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx remove ch100-5 to avoid spam trap

.

Re: The real twin paradox.