

Re: Division by Zero in Nature, and Decomposition of Time.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/0645.html>

From: Lefty (*Ye_at_h.Right*)

Date: 01/02/05

Date: Sun, 02 Jan 2005 04:10:26 GMT

>>>>> *An example of division by zero in nature.*
>>> *[snip]*
>>>
>>>> *Thanks Bill, and I've got plenty of applications for this up my*
> *sleeve.*
>>> *[snip]*
>>>
>>> *An empirical differentiation between mere unfortunate ignorance and*
>>> *full-blown metastatic stupidity.*
>>
>> *What was that thing they used to say on TV –*
>>
>> *Is that your _final_ answer ?*
>>
>>
>>>> *This is just the first installment of something*
>>>> *which is really much, much larger.*
>>>
>>> *No doubt.*
>>
>> *We need to build things piece by piece. I'm giving you something fairly*
>> *straightforward to attack, it is just one simple operation, a single*
>> *instance of division.*
>>
>> *Either it makes sense, or it's an attempt to square the circle.*
>
> *It is mental masturbation pure and simple. Your idea of constructing a*
clock
> *out of the entire universe, a solar system or whatever rubbish you are*
> *proposing in no way changes the definition of a second which is what is*
use
> *in experiments so has zero observation consequences.*

And I'm asking you why ?

> > *I'm giving*
> > *you every opportunity, and I would in fact invite you to disprove it, if*
> *you*
> > *can show me the error I'll tell you what, I'll put \$20 on your PayPal*
> *acct.*
> > *Please – save me the trouble of worrying about this stuff. Prove me*
> *wrong.*
> > *All I said was that time decomposes, and basically proved it, \$20 says*
> *I'm*
> > *right. I think that Thomas Jefferson is going to agree with me.*
>
> *And who will be the judge – why you of course. I have seen crank spew*
> *long*
> *enough to know all its tricks.*

And I'm asking you why ?

> > *I am not saying that Einstein, Pauli and Schrodinger were wrong. All I'm*
> > *saying, is that neither were Larry Moe and Curley.*
>
> *You are indulging in mental masturbation that has zero observational*
> *consequences and trying to palm it off as insight.*

And I'm asking you why ?

–WK–

> *Bill*
>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>> --
>>> *Uncle Al*
>>> <http://www.mazepath.com/uncleal/>
>>> *(Toxic URL! Unsafe for children and most mammals)*
>>> <http://www.mazepath.com/uncleal/qz.pdf>
>>
>>
>
>