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

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005−01/0654.html

---

From: Lefty (*Ye_at_h.Right*)
Date: 01/02/05

Date: Sun, 02 Jan 2005 05:17:52 GMT

"Puppet_Sock" <puppet_sock@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:1104639508.681017.249730@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...
> 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.

I've covered this already, but I'll do it again if neccesary. Yes, you can build a clock from a non−cyclic process or event, but − that event _is_ itself a single cycle. This is why you can attribute wavelength and frequency to blast waves or tidal waves.

Even a single event can be considered a cycle. The biggest astronomical events, or cycles, will cause your clock to divide by zero, which cant happen, and so 4D spacetime collapses into 3D because time ceases to exist relative to an observer. This is really simple !

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

OK − so maybe the moon spins faster or slower. Whatever. You know what I meant, it orbits the Earth maybe 12 ro 13 times per year. A ratio of 12:1, or 13:1. Close enough for FermiMath.

> > 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.*

Already covered −

> *> > 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.*

Already covered −
We're talking about limits here.

> *> > and*
> *> > the universe simply cannot divide by zero.*
> *>*
> *> Sure it can. Does it all the time. It's called L'Hopital's rule.*

Now that was funny !! :)

> *> > 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.*

If time ceases to exist (relative to an observer), then what would happen to
"spacetime" ???

How can it possibly _not_ follow ?

> *> > 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.

− well, actually not.

> > 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.
>
> 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

Darn that sock, it's full of holes. :)

All we are talking about here is simple division, and the largest possible clock that one might be able to construct.

I think that your reply was perhaps copied and pasted without even reading the original post.

The facts contained in the original post are quite elementary. If you think that calculus can be used to disprove my claims, then SHOW ME some, and I WILL PUT A $20 THOMAS JEFFERSON ON YOUR PAYPAL ACCT.

−WK−