

Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent

# Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-01/msg03887.html>

---

- *From:* [Hero.van.Jindelt@xxxxxx](mailto:Hero.van.Jindelt@xxxxxx)
  - *Date:* 30 Jan 2006 00:31:23 -0800
- 

> Hero.van.Jindelt@xxxxxx wrote:  
>> Ken S. Tucker wrote:  
>>> Hero.van.Jindelt@xxxxxx wrote:  
>>>> Ken S. Tucker wrote about  
>>>>>> ....an orthogonal 4D....  
>>>> "Can You explain, how a fourth dimension can be orthogonal to the  
>>>> three of space, measured in  $\text{cm}^3$ ?  
>>> 3 spatial dimensions and 1 time dimension, is commonly  
>>> called 4D. An \*orthogonal\* 4D implies 3 orthogonal spatial  
>>> axes x,y,z, and 1 time axis perpendicular to x,y,z.  
>  
>> Ken, again avoiding "body contact", replacing "orthogonal" by  
>> "perpendicular".  
>> Your are thinking too much coordinate-minded, 3D with a point of  
>> origin. That's how we all are brought up,.....  
>  
> The above meanders much to much for me without focusing on  
> any particular problem.

Nobody is stopping You to hit the focus: tell us, what You think, when  
You talk  
about "... 1 time axis perpendicular to x,y,z."

.....  
>> Nowadays i go this way:  
>> Going from one point to a different point, gives a point and a  
>> direction (1D=2P=two points).....  
>>  
>> Now, not to forget about all the 4D-talk, most basic:  
>> 0D, a point. (0D=1P) !!  
>>  
>> In here we all saw lots of 2D pictures of what is named "4D-space" -  
>> but that's not what we are talking about. We both talk about a 3D-space  
>> and we both can proceed to dynamic geometry: ( 3D, time).But time being  
>> "orthogonal" or "perpendicular" to space or something of it ?  
>>  
>> A three-hours-walk can be a distance (with speed known) .....  
>>>> Please show me "an orthogonal 4D".  
>>>>

Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent

Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent

>>> Ok, ...  
>> That would be great.....  
>>> A term like  
>>> "orthogonal" can be easy to explain but difficult to define.  
>>> Ken  
>> I put my trust in You.  
> Perhaps you could make a succinct argument/question,  
Why? Ken, You said "Ok."  
> I think you'll get more replies.  
> Ken  
I'm afraid, we will not get an explanation from You. May be Time is  
different from Space.  
If i looked it up correct, then a 'pendiculum' is a balance of weights,  
horizontal to earth–surface.  
And 'perpendicular" thus means vertical, straight through the  
horizontal balance. We can add  
to these two directions, which are at a right angle to each other, the  
axis of the balance, when it  
balances or moves, again at a right angle to the two others.  
No place for time left, unless You show us.It seems You cannot, so i've  
got the impression,  
that You are in connection with these people, who want to revive the  
medivial obscure theory,  
that the earth is not moving, to which we all know the famous reply: "  
....and yet she moves!"  
One can freeze movements, bring a balance to rest – but times...  
they area achanging. I like this.  
Thanks for Your comments.  
Regards  
Hero

---

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**  
◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

• *References:*

- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**  
◇ From: mmeron
- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**  
◇ From: Ken S. Tucker
- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**  
◇ From: Timo Nieminen
- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**  
◇ From: Ken S. Tucker
- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**  
◇ From: FrediFizzx
- ◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: FrediFizzx

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: FrediFizzx

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: FrediFizzx

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Hero . van . Jindelt

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Hero . van . Jindelt

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Hero . van . Jindelt

◆ **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**

◇ From: Ken S. Tucker

- Prev by Date: **Re: Size as Direction**
- Next by Date: **Re: What does it take to be a physicist?**
- Previous by thread: **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**
- Next by thread: **Re: resolve to perpendicular components, because they are independent**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**