

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-01/10442.html>

From: Androcles (*dummy_at_dummy.net*)

Date: 01/27/05

Date: Thu, 27 Jan 2005 17:08:35 GMT

"Timo Nieminen" <timo@physics.uq.edu.au> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.50.0501271444400.14575-100000@localhost...

> *On Thu, 27 Jan 2005, Androcles wrote:*

>

>> *"Timo Nieminen" <timo@physics.uq.edu.au> wrote:*

>> > *On Thu, 27 Jan 2005, Androcles wrote:*

>> >

>> >> *4th axiom...*

>> >>

>> >> *Now, is (x,y,z,t) a vector?*

>> >>

>> >> *Does there exist a $-t$ such that $-t + t = 0$?*

>> >>

>> >> *Or, in simpler terms that you use as you teaching method, do tell*

>> >> *us*

>> >> *what is the magnitude and direction of time?*

>> >

>> > *I'm a little surprised to see you asking this again, since you and*

>> > *I*

>> > *discussed this so recently.*

>>

>> *Yes, but you haven't a clue and are a total waste of time.*

>

> *Avoiding the issue by dealing insults.*

The fuck I am. I can deal with the issue AND dole out insults.

> *One of your typical tactics.*

Bullshit, here you are making derogatory remarks right now.

> *So*

> *mature and resourceful of you!*

Pot. Kettle. Black.

> *Of course, logic might be more effective.*

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

Talking about me is dealing with the issue, is it?

>
>> > *Anyway, given that you ask the question*
>> > *again, perhaps this is a good place to summarise the conclusion:*
>> >
>> > *Choose a time to be the origin of a time coordinate axis. Times*
>> > *later*
>> > *than*
>> > *the origin will be positive, earlier times will be negative. The*
>> > *magnitude*
>> > *of the time coordinate is equal to the length of the time interval*
>> > *from*
>> > *the origin to the time represented by the time coordinate.*
>> >
>> > *Choose 4 pm to be the origin. At twenty past four, we have*
>> > *$t_1 = t = 20$ minutes. Twenty to four would then be $t_2 = (-t) = -20$*
>> > *minutes.*
>>
>> *Learn what a scalar is, Nieminen, because you are juggling them as if*
>> *they were vectors. Scalars are not vectors.*
>> *The scalar -1 is not the vector $-t$. There is no vector $-t$.*
>
> *Do you know the difference between a vector and a component of a*
> *vector?*

There isn't a difference. Components of vectors are themselves vectors.
Why do you ask? Did you imagine there was a difference?

> *Do you know that the definition of a vector space requires the vector*
> *$(-1)*t$ to be equal to $(-t)$?*

Yes, I do know that, and I know that physically, $-t$ doesn't exist.
The idiot Einstein thinks he can physically change time by jumping
into a spaceship and driving fast. Physically change. Not just talk
about
it, physically change it. That's because the idiot Einstein thinks time
has an inverse. Like you, he thinks he can make it have an inverse just
by
writing -1 in front.
Nieminen, you owe me £100 because I've just written it down, therefore
that
makes it real. Pay up.
Do you know the difference between fiction and reality?
Obviously not.

>
> *If we choose 4pm to be the origin, later times to be positive, and*
> *earlier*
> *times to be negative, then 20 past four is $t = 20$ minutes. Yes or no?*

sci.physics: Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

Not according to Einstein. I leave the coordinate (x, y, z, 4:00 pm) as you do, I'm flying along at 0.866c. I slam the brakes on when I get to coordinate (x+2, y, z, 4:10) and arrive to witness the 4:15 event, which you missed.

I turn around and zip back at 0.9999c, slam the brakes on again at coordinate (x+1, y, z, 4:18 pm) where you are, and tell you about the elephant I saw laying an egg three minutes ago that you on your way to go and see.

You travel into my past and I'll believe time is a vector. Tell me yesterday about events that will happen tomorrow. I'll pick up the phone to Ladbrokes and place a bet on the winner of the 4:15 at Aintree.

> *What is the time-coordinate assigned to twenty to four?*

We don't assign coordinates to time as if it were a vector.

>

>> *If I have two opposing forces, as in a tug o' war, I have two opposing force vectors. I can yell "Heave" and increase the scalar on both teams.*

>>

>> *The team with the greatest scalar wins.*

>

No, at this point it seems like a good idea to ask you to define "vector", "physical", "paradox", "speed", "logical", "reductio-ad-absurdum", "theroem", "proof", "proof by contradiction", "proof by induction" and a host of other words you don't seem to know the meaning of.

> *Are you (mis)using scalar to mean "magnitude of a vector quantity"?*

That is what YOU are doing. Time is not a vector, it has no inverse.

>> *It is the vector itself, with unit scalar, that has to have an inverse.*

>> *Time has NO inverse. You can go from 4:00 pm to 4:20 pm (in fact you cannot avoid it) but you can NEVER go from 4:00 pm to 3:40 pm. There is no inverse time. Saying that 3:40 exists or did once exist does NOT make time a vector.*

>>

>> *Let's try this. I'll use zero as my scalar. It's 4:00 pm. Time will march on to 4:20 pm. Apply the scalar. It is still 4:00 pm. Go ahead and do it. Prove you can stay at 4:00 pm.*

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

sci.physics: Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

>

> *Why does time travel have to do with?*

Ask Einstein. He's the cretin that thinks time can be reversed or slowed.

> *Time coordinates are just a*

> *mathematical description of time.*

If you wish to use a notation (x,y,z,t), do so, but it isn't a vector.

> *You don't have to be able to go to a*

> *particular time for a mathematical description to label that time.*

Labels are not vectors. I don't care if you write -apple on an apple, the apple is still an apple and not a vector. There is no -apple. I cannot collide a -apple with a +apple and get nothing. Labels are not physics. Labels are tools to aid understanding.

>

> *Is 6 hours earlier than 6 hours later than now a time other than now,*

> *or*

> *is it now?*

Other than, of course. What's your point?

Oh wait, I know. $3:40 + 4:20 = 4:00$, right?

Idiot.

Yeah, there's another insult. Actually it isn't an insult, its a statement of fact.

>> > *Since $t1 + t2 = t + (-t) = 20 + -20 = 0$, $t2$ is the additive inverse*

>> > *of*

>> > *t1.*

>>

>> *No it isn't. You have not stopped time. You have only shown that 4:00*

>> *pm*

>> *once was.*

>

> *I'm not claiming to have stopped time.*

Yes you are. You are claiming $(\text{now}-6) + (\text{now} +6) = \text{now}$.

I jump in to my spaceship at (x,y,z, now-6), travel at 0.866c in a huge circle

and arrive at (x+1,y,z, now-3), three hours early to meet you now.

I sit on my duff waiting for you to arrive, time standing still, because $(\text{now}-3) = \text{now}$.

> *You might note that if we choose*

> *the origin to be 4pm 3 days from now, *both* times lie in the future.*

> *How*

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

sci.physics: Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

> *can time travel into the past be possibly required for that?*

Well, there you are, then. Jump in your spaceship and meet me at 4:00 pm three days from now, then get back in it and meet me tomorrow and tell me what I will say two days from now, since you will have already read my post. Just copy it three days from now and paste it tomorrow.

Or perhaps you'll be forever in my future and we can never meet again. Go down to the beach with a big stick and write in the sand "Neiminen woz here, 30/1/05 at 4:00 pm".

>

> *The requirements for time to be labelable by a time coordinate that is the component of a 1D vector are simple.*

As simple as your mind.

> *No travel, whether physical travel or time travel is required by the mathematical definition.*

So long as you don't call it a vector, that's fine.
A grocery shopping list is useful, but it isn't a vector.

> *Why do you continually insist that it is?*

I'm not the one calling time a vector, why do you continually insist that it is?

> *Please, point out in an accepted definition of a vector that such travel must be possible!*

Sure. (x) is a vector.
I can travel from (0) to (x) and from (x) to (0).
(t) is not a vector.
I am forced to travel from (0) to (t), but I cannot travel from (t) to (0)

>

>> *Since twenty to four existed/will exist (depending on exactly which 4pm is chosen to be the origin) this is a physically meaningful time,*
>>
>> *No it isn't physically meaningful. Even if your chosen 4:00 pm will exist, it will pass and become 4:00 pm did exist, and you cannot stop it from happening.*

>

> *So, are you saying that twenty to four is not a physically meaningful*

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

sci.physics: Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

> *time?*

It is physically meaningful, but it isn't a vector.

> *From a physical perspective, the description of times by a vector*

> *simply*

> *means that time later than the origin have a positive vector*

> *component,*

> *and times earlier than the origin have a negative vector component.*

> *From a physical perspective, the description of foods by a grocery list*

simply

means these are the items I wish to purchase. The list is not a vector, and the labels are not the items themselves.

It is physically meaningful, but it isn't a vector.

> *Are you really trying to say that "3 hours ago" is not physically*

> *meaningful?*

I am saying you are a fucking idiot. Of course it is meaningful, but it is NOT a vector, anymore than a list of groceries is a vector.

> *Alas, it's a cornerstone of the great edifice that is*

> *Galilean–Newtonian*

> *mechanics.*

Bullshit.

In Galilean–Newtonian mechanics, $t' = t$.

I guess you must disagree with the results of that field of

> *physics, too.*

Bullshit. Galilean–Newtonian mechanics does not and never has treated time as if it were a vector, and never will, but ypu go on guessing, I'm not interested in your guesses. You are an idiot.

>

> *Hint: if you want to be a successful anti–SR advocate, it might be*

> *worthwhile attacking the differences between SR and Newtonian physics,*

> *not*

> *the points that they have in common.*

What the fuck do you think I'm doing?

SR treats time as if it were a vector. Newtonian physics does not.

That IS the difference.

SR claims the speed of light is invariant.

Newtonian physics says length and time are invariant.

Fucking "hint" indeed.

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

sci.physics: Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

Hint: $c = d(x)/d(\tau) \neq dx/dt$.

Hint: You are an idiot.

>

>> *There is nothing about making time a vector that is physically meaningful.*
>> *Time does exist, yes, but it is NOT a vector, anymore than (apple, orange) is a vector. You cannot turn apples into oranges by rotating the*
>> *supposed vector, but you can turn x into y by rotating the vector*
>> *(x,y)*
>> *into (y,x).*

>

> *Oh my! You must be proud of that irrelevant smokescreen*

You must be proud to claim time is a vector, asshole.

Hint: You are an idiot.

>

> *Alas, logical argument (as opposed to debate, where such things as irrelevant diversions, lying, ignoring evidence, making up your own definitions, and shouting down the opposition can actually be successful tactics) is not the place for that kind of thing.*

Then what to fuck are you doing it for ?

You've the burden of proving time is a vector, and since it isn't, having

no inverse, your task is futile. Your irrelevant diversions into 4:00 pm is physically

meaningful, THEREFORE it MUST be a vector, is absolute bullshit.

Hint: You are an idiot.

>

> *Since you have no reply of substance, merely an unsubstantiated claim that the mathematical definition of a vector (or did you mean additive inverse?) requires travel through space or time, I think it can be safely assumed that you have no valid counterargument.*

You have not substantiated time is vector because you can write

(x,y,z,t) with

any logical argument I've seen.

I think it can be safely assumed that you had no valid argument to begin with.

>

>> > *provided the time axis is infinite and unbounded, the same can be done for*

Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

sci.physics: Re: Hansen discovers how to reason.

>> > *any time t, and thus the requirement of existence of an additive*
>> > *inverse*
>> > *is satisfied.*
>>
>> *No it isn't.*
>
> *By the usual mathematical definition of an additive inverse, it is.*

Bullshit. The mathematical definition of a vector doesn't apply to grocery lists or time.

There are no negative apples and there is no negative time

Hint: You are an idiot.

>
>> *You cannot stop time passing, or reverse it, or change it*
>> *in any way.*
>
> *And this requirement can be found exactly where in the mathematical*
> *definition of an addition inverse, or for that matter, a vector space?*
You tell me, you are the one claiming time is a vector.

Androcles.

> --
> *Timo*