

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-07/6721.html>

From: Androcles (*androcles_at_nospamblueyonder.co.uk*)

Date: 07/22/04

Date: Thu, 22 Jul 2004 00:03:50 GMT

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

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

| > "Darrin Edwards" <edwards@nouce.trurl.bsd.uchicago.edu> wrote in message
| > news:slrncfrf5f.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.

No sensible physicist would seriously make such a gross error as travelling backwards in time. If you know of one, he's actually a kook.

(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.)

|

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

|>| 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.
|
| 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 four
| miles an hour.

When you can reduce the time it takes you to get there to zero by walking at
186,000 miles per second, arriving instantly, let me know. When you can go
home again, arriving where you were when you were, you can call time a
vector. Until then, it isn't.

But none of what you said has anything to do with time
| being modeled as a (one-dimensional) vector.
|
| Are you familiar with the definition of "vector"?
Yes. You can find references to it all over the internet. Look it up,
vectors have inverses.

If so, what
| specific property of a (one-dimensional) vector space are you claiming
| is _not_ possessed by time?

No inverse. I've told you that already.

|
| Some hints:
I don't need any fucking hints, or stupidity about time being a vector.

you can add two times together to get another time, and
| you can multiply a time by a number to get another time. As for the
| "unwaiting -1 second" red herring above, if someone says their plane
| leaves in five hours, and that they have to leave home for the airport
| three hours _before_ that, is anyone really mystified by the conclusion
| that they have $5-3=2$ hours left to pack?

It's 6:00 pm, the plane leaves at 5:00 pm. Go and board the plane, you
have -1 hour to do so. Since time is a vector, -1 hour should be no trouble
to you.

If there are any red herrings around here, it is $5-3 = 2$ when the 5 exists
in the future.

Do so when it is in the past and time will be a vector.
Androcles.

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

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

|
| --
| Cheers,
| Darrin