

Re: The Modulus Project

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2007-05/msg00929.html>

- *From:* Y <yanarchi@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 6 May 2007 05:07:18 -0700
-

better just to say $x = \text{distance}$ $y = \text{distance}$ $z = \text{'time'}$

If you place the model at the center of mass of the sun, draw a line that is the orbit of the earth around the sun around the d/d axis, 'should be something close to a circle'

you should get a rate of change for 'time' which is relative between the center of the sun and the center of the earth. To children; This is still no reason to be late for school. Perhaps we should start by asking the children why ? Let them think about it first. We should also not forget Calculus. Calculus is directly relational to Modulus.

I shall not post the answer to this question; because children should never cheat on their exams ! They should know that time DOES exist, but a passage is so far unobservable, and so they should know the difference. Perhaps the more distance we travel together we will develop the ability to see a passage for time in the same way DNA found a way to see ? The potential for people is unlimited in the same way that our equations are. There is still much much more to find out. For instance, what is the distance between a moving person on the face of the planet from the center of the sun at any given time ?? I suspect this will be a high school question (Maybe university level at this stage).

For instance, the axis of the earth is at an angle to the orbit a rotation around the sun. What is this angle relative to the sun how does it change with time ? What is North and South, East and West and how does it relate to our planet ?

hmmm, I think we may need to revise plans on the space elevator for a little bit. At first I was very optimistic, but its like throwing an old car away if you know what I mean. Something about upsetting the inertia of the planet seems as though it may have a terrible long term consequence.

Does anyone here think that the time will change at the center of the earth, as it does from the surface of the earth ? Something tells me that if a force is driving the clock then no, but maybe if the clock

Re: The Modulus Project

is an inertia meter it will have a different rate.

Anyway, ,happy public holidays.

Sorry. I did make a mistake in my last post.

Point 7. All models must obey the laws of nature. Not observe. We do not observe a passage for time, but that doesn't make it unimportant. I apologise for the mistake but this is taking shape rather than simply just 'being'. In the human world things are always taking shape. :) Make lovely shapes with Modulus !

-y

On May 6, 4:24 pm, Y <yanar...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I am starting Modulus on the assumption that a passage for time is invisible.

1. The passage for time is Invisible.
2. The units of time are a modularity based on something invisible. The units are visible.
3. Time is an expression of distance / distance. Time is always observed and expressed by distances.
4. Distance is based on the smallest VISIBLE points of reference.

i.e. In any given position there are an (x) number of nanometers to the center of the sun.

5. Time is a three dimensional object that rotates.
6. Time is a model.
7. ALL models must observe the LAWS of Nature.
8. Time is a representation therefore there is no passage of time.
9. Moving faster than the speed of light will cause one to disappear then reappear when they slowed down to another observer.
10. The eye can only see light, therefore if one moved towards a clock at the speed of light they would SEE

NOTHING !.Because the photons (which your eyes can see and see only) would compress and form a boundary against the retina.

11. If the clock and the eye moved at the speed of light together, you still couldn't read the time because any light in that system would be traveling in the same direction.

The only way to travel at the speed of light is to produce a surface of infinite density. But this will not be time travel. It will just be very very fast.

Re: The Modulus Project

-y

On May 6, 1:40 pm, "Ahmed Ouahi, Architect" <ahmed.ou...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

First of all, Yan, everything is a strictly and absolutely a possible, you do have only to turn away, from anything which is a conventional as to run from any conventional details.

Therefore, for instance, along the geometry of the space, you would be having an absolute possibility to divide the 0, something none would be able, along any Euclidian geometry, and this is the great escape along the space, in the real meaning of the terms, a definitely as a matter a fact.

—
Ahmed Ouahi, Architect
Best Regards!

"Y" <yanar...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1178419619.503836.116550@xx

I think I am close to a new system of mathematical expression. But I would like to discuss this openly in another forum. It might be used for physics, but not sure at this point.

I am going to call this Modulus, which is a logical opponent to Calculus. It is my intention to not let this 'modulus' become the problem that calculus became. I think the first most important decision to make is regarding the transcendental numbers.

Re: The Modulus Project

I think we can (squeeze) nature into expression if we agree that there are an infinitely divisible number of points or distances between any 0 and 1.

One problem with calculus is Leibniz's monad. Essentially the monad is allot like Hawking's singularity, except that it was conscious oriented. i.e. an infinitely small point of consciousness. So clearly he and Newton thought allot about the Gods. Leibniz was a Kabbahlist.

Drawing inference from points, one always assumes the precise measure of a man over the actual distances between things in Nature. If we accept the fact of our humanity we would know that our brains, are not infinitely small or large. We exist somewhere in between. It is a gruesome example that I am about to give, so please be prepared to read this, ----- the brain is not infinitely dense otherwise water and other atoms wouldn't replace themselves within the substrate.

So relating this back to the ACTUALITY means (Da) Distance (actual) as I discussed previously, we can determine a rate of measure that does not assume the infinitely inaccurate measure of 'distance' and 'time' and arrive at paradox. We can however assume that one measure is imperfect, and the other is too perfect to claim for ourselves.

I think we can place this down to what we determine to be the difference as visible and invisible. And we will also need to install

Re: The Modulus Project

disaster disclaimers as with the creation with any new tool.

So I would really like to discuss this with allot of people first.

These are just some ideas they may be flawed and I would like to hear the reasons and comments.

For those interested in starting a new forum for the discussion of Modulus please email me direct.

yanar...@xxxxxxxxxxxx