[Another Successful Troll by Herc] (no longer mentions): Infinite number of people toss a coin infinite times

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004−12/2549.html

---

From: Kent Paul Dolan (*xanthian_at_well.com*)
Date: 11/28/04

Date: Sun, 28 Nov 2004 22:02:04 +0000 (UTC)

"Stephen Harris" <cyberguard1048−usenet@yahoo.com>
wrote and quoted:

|− This answers part of my question within the Big
|− Bang theory context. "Note that in the above
|− paragraphs I have been careful to use the term
|− "observable Universe" rather than Universe. The
|− Universe itself, or the maximum amount of space
|− that we will eventually be able to see given an
|− infinite amount of time, may well be infinite. In
|− quoting a size of the Universe we infer how far we
|− can see in one direction (15 billion light years),
|− and how far we can see in the other direction (15
|− billion light years) and add the two to get a size
|− (30 billion light years). An age of 15 billion
|− light years in each direction therefore leads us
|− to infer that we are at the centre of a sphere
|− with radius 15 billion light−years, and hence that
|− the Universe is 30 billion light−years "across".
|− The trick, however, is that because the Universe
|− is homogeneous and isotropic, every observer must
|− measure a size of the Universe that is 30 billion
|− light years... even ones that are at the "edge" of
|− our observable Universe! This means that either
|− the Universe is sufficiently curved that space
|− doubles back on itself (like on the surface of a
|− sphere), or that the actual Universe is much
|− larger than the observable one. We currently think
|− that the latter possibility is the case."

Um, no, not at all. Observers on the edge of _our_
observable universe are at, or very near, the epoch
of the big bang. _Their_ observable universe is
much, much smaller, and so stuff there is much

closer together. In the limit of our possible
observation, their universe collapses to something
the size of a subatomic particle diameter or less.

The universe may be "homogeneous and isotropic", but
that is merely a hypothesis, not a theory subject to
falsifiability, even _in_ theory, since we can't
see *that* universe. The one _we_ see grows denser
and younger with distance. [It also isn't the least
bit "isotropic"; it has structure at every scale.]

xanthian.

It's always valuable to remember this recent
interchange before wasting a lot of Net bandwidth on
another of Herc's inane trolls:

> Its like talking to someone with amnesia,
> forget Kent he's a moron who
> takes antipsychotics all day.
> −− Herc (gotch@beauty.com)

> Well, I just did a bit of a search through some
> of your recentish posts (just a few months ago)
> in comp.theory. [...] Seems Kent Paul Dolan
> was right about you, and that it would just be
> a waste of time for me to continue 'discussing'
> your 'solution(s)' with you.
> −− Simon G Best (s.g.best@btopenworld.com)