

Re: SR's velocity addition -- ANY Experimental Evidence?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/6711.html>

From: Darrin Edwards (edwards_at_nouce.trurl.bsd.uchicago.edu)

Date: 07/21/04

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 2004 23:37:01 GMT

In article <bTsLc.4695\$PY3.46950542@news-text.cableinet.net>, Androcles wrote:

> "Darrin Edwards" <edwards@nouce.trurl.bsd.uchicago.edu> wrote in message
> news:slrncfrj5f.hie.edwards@trurl.bsd.uchicago.edu...

>| In article <ctaLc.3976\$Sn2.39699610@news-text.cableinet.net>, Androcles
>| wrote:

>| > Time is not a vector,

>|

>| Sure it is, it's modeled as a one-dimensional vector.

>|

>| > it has no inverse.

>|

>| Cf. the English word "ago".

>|

>| > You can return from where you were by travelling a distance 1 mile

>| > and returning a distance of -1 mile. When you are able to return to

>| > when you were by waiting one second and then unwaiting -1 second

>| > then you can call time a vector, and not before.

>|

>| That's because of physics.

>

> Yes, and physics is the topic of discussion.

And in physics, time is modelled as a (one-dimensional) vector. (At least in classical mechanics, special relativity, quantum mechanics... I had always assumed the same was true of GR, but would welcome correction on this point.)

>| Mathematically, time is modelled as a

>| one-dimensional vector in both Newtonian mechanics and SR.

>

> Mathematics is Art.

> Scientists and Engineers use math as a useful tool, but that doesn't entitle

> anyone to pretend they can convert time into distance, mass into time or

> distance into mass, even if it possible to do so mathematically. GIGO

> applies.

sci.physics: Re: SR's velocity addition -- ANY Experimental Evidence?

I don't need to "pretend" I can convert time into distance; every day
I convert a half hour of my time into the roughly two miles between my
home + workplace by the simple expedient of walking at roughly