

# Re: Rigorous definition of Planck's Constant

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-04/msg00582.html>

---

- *From:* Uncle Al <UncleAl0@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 06 Apr 2008 15:40:48 -0700
- 

Tom Potter wrote:

As some of my fans

null set

seem to be more interested in my views on physics,

like a plumber with a photoalbum of turds,

than my views on the human condition,

You lack boundary conditions

( What is more important, black holes or the human condition? )  
I offer the following for their consideration.

[snip crap]

Consider a system composed of one electron and one proton.

[snip crap]

It's been done. 1.4204057517667 GHz

1. Let  $M(P)$  = the mass of the proton.
2. Let  $M(E)$  the mass of the electron.
3. Let  $C$  = a universal distance per time constant. ( The speed of light. )
4. Two bodies interact about a common point in a common time.

## Re: Rigorous definition of Planck's Constant

No, stooopid. Quantum mechanics matters, particularly singlet and triplet spin. If one body is relativistic its clock is ambiguous.

The common point is the center of mass of the system

[snip crap]

Bullshit – how do you propose to locate each contributor and then still know its trajectory?

and the common time is the period of the system.

[snip lots of crap]

Bullshit. Relativity and moving masses.

4. I emphasized distances, rather than more fundamental times and angular displacements, in order to more clearly show the relationships between the common physical constants.

A relativistic universe has four distinct distances: luminosity (inverse square), angular diameter, parallax, and proper motion. No two of them need agree to maintain consistency. Clocks can only be synchronized by being local.

Idiot.

Have at it fans!

<http://www.mazepath.com/uncleal/sunshine.jpg>

Light at the end of a tunnel.

—

Uncle Al

<http://www.mazepath.com/uncleal/>

(Toxic URL! Unsafe for children and most mammals)

<http://www.mazepath.com/uncleal/lajos.htm#a2>

.