

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/0646.html>

---

**From:** Puppet\_Sock ([puppet\\_sock\\_at\\_hotmail.com](mailto:puppet_sock_at_hotmail.com))

**Date:** 01/02/05

Date: 1 Jan 2005 20:18:28 -0800

Lefty wrote:

[snip]

> *Our understanding of time, and our ability to measure it is based on cycles*  
> *in nature.*

Not really. It *\*starts\** with cycles, historically, but is not limited to cycles. It is based on change, sometimes cyclic change, sometimes non-cyclic change. Clocks can be built from various non-cyclic processes. For example, it is possible to make a clock from chemical reactions.

[stupid numerology snipped: the moon's orbit is not exactly 1/12 of a year, not even to two significant digits]

> *Now, lets see you build a clock out of the whole universe!*

This is a silly requirement. We don't need to be bothered with "the whole universe" to build a clock, as you've already stated.

> *There is a*

> *problem. It is so huge, that even if it has some gross, collective motion*

> *such as rotation, it is just so vast that we simply cannot observe such*

> *motions. They cant be measured with any instrument, and even if you could,*

> *they would be either zero or very near zero relative to everything else in*

> *the universe.*

And if we *\*were\** to use the entire universe as a clock, we would not be limited to rotation to do it. Expansion, for example, would be a candidate.

> *So, you have a ratio which is basically 1 : 0 or something like that,*

"Or something like that." Actually, it's a meaningless statement.  
You don't need rotation to make a clock.

- > *and*
- > *the universe simply cannot divide by zero.*

Sure it can. Does it all the time. It's called L'Hopital's rule.

- > *So, the only reasonable*
- > *conclusion, and it's really very simple, is that 4 dimensional*  
spacetime
- > *decomposes into 3 dimensional space as time becomes unobservable*  
(relative
- > *to an observer).*

None of this is in any way supported by anything you have stated.  
You have not even supported the notion that there \*is\* a spacetime,  
nor that it decomposes, never mind that it is 3+1 dimensional.

- > *You cannot build a clock out of the the whole universe because the*  
large
- > *scale motions are so close to zero, relative to us. Time is therefore*
- > *unmeasurable, and unobservable, relative to us. And, if it is*  
unmeasurable,
- > *and unobservable, then time ceases to exist on that scale, relative*  
to us.

More junk that does not follow from what you've said previously.  
You are simply spewing out word salad with no connection to what  
you've already said.

- > *The same must also be true of the quantum world. Things can become so*  
small
- > *that they simply do not exist relative to an observer such as us.*

This is complete nonsense.

- > *It seems that we are trapped between two worlds, the extremely large,*  
and
- > *the extremely small. We are somewhere in the middle. Additionally, it*  
seems
- > *that the fabric of 4D spacetime decomposes into a 3 dimensional*  
state,
- > *possibly decomposing into a state which is nonexistent relative to an*  
> *observer.*

None of this follows from what you've said. None of this is defined.  
You've not said anything that has any meaning. At the very best,  
what you've done is spew some bad poetry.

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

Instead of spewing out word salad, you could consider actually reading a few books on geometry, calculus, etc. A position of ignorance is rarely a good position to produce anything useful.

Socks