Science

by Dr. Irene Galtung

Forward

Science is mathematics. What is mathematics?
Science seeks to uncover truths.

In this book, I destroy “science”.

(and I break the spacetime continuum! 🌞)

8 July 2017
Dr. Irene Galtung

There is 1 universe. It cannot be divided. 1 is a prime number. The universe is infinite. The universe is everything that exists. Infinity = 1

Science is mathematics. What is mathematics?
Science seeks to uncover truths.

In this book, I destroy "science".

(and I break the spacetime continuum! 🌞)

I destroy:
quantum mechanics
the Standard Model of particle physics
special theory of relativity and general theory of relativity
Newton's "science", Archimedes' "science"...

What shall I start with?...
Shall I start with stories about an apple falling on someone's head? Shall I start with stories about someone shouting "Eureka!" in a bathtub? ("Eureka!" in Greek means "I have found it!")

Shall I start with the story about how I broke the spacetime continuum?

Yes, I'll start with that.

The story about how I broke the spacetime continuum

This book is about science.

"Science" is based on factually incorrect "mathematics". "Science" is false.
"Science" is factually incorrect.
"Mathematics" is factually incorrect.

Science is factually correct.
Mathematics is factually correct.

I wrote a mathematics manuscript.
The manuscript is necessary and sufficient to understand mathematics.

What is science? What is mathematics?

Does science have anything to do with conscience (doing what is morally right)? Con**science**?

If it does (if science has something to do with doing what is morally right), then show me a scientist.

It will take a few pages to tell the story about how I broke the spacetime continuum 🌞.

[First, we must understand "science" and science.]

Let's talk about "science" and science

------ I put it to you, that whatever scientific "law" has been discovered, will at some point be disproved.

------ I put it to you that all seeming paradoxes in "science" are either a play on words, or incorrect conclusions resulting from mistakes that have been built on other mistakes. The same goes for "mathematics". Science is mathematics. Science seeks to uncover truths.

------ I put it to you, that if you can find something bigger than what you thought was the biggest, then what you found before wasn't infinity.

> ...Infinity concerns the boundless, endless; something that has no end.
> ...I say, we need to distinguish between boundless, endless, big, small.
> ...Infinity, is (in the end) (haha, little joke) about what I said: if you can find something bigger than what you thought was the biggest, then what you found before wasn't infinity.

Let's talk about "science"

"Science" is based on factually incorrect "mathematics". "Science" is false.
"Science" is factually incorrect.
"Mathematics" is factually incorrect.

1. "Mathematics" has led to scientific laws? No.

Here are 3 comments about science:

Comment 1.
To say something is approximately true, you would have to know what is true; then you can see if you were approximately correct, or very incorrect (intentionally…or unintentionally misleading). Likewise, to say something is more approximately true, you would have to know what is true.

Comment 2.
If the tools used to test/make measurements are inaccurate, they will keep inaccurately confirming what you inaccurately state.

Comment 3.
What about technology? Does technology show "science", "mathematics" work?

We have technology. Technology has been used in medicine. Technology also created new illnesses. Technology at times saves lives. Technology also created ways to kill people and bomb our Earth.

You do the math. Does "mathematics" --"work"? Does "science" "work"? How will you make the calculations (the advantages vs. the disadvantages of technology)? Will you make the calculations with the same factually incorrect "mathematics"?

...I would call "mathematics", Be Careful Activity.
...I would call technology, Be Careful Activity.
...I would call "science", Be Careful Activity. (Examples of "science" include: "chemistry", "physics", "economics").

2. Is “science” useful? What about technology, etc.?

Does “science” do more good than bad? More bad than good?
Has technology done more bad than good? More good than bad?
What’s the balance sheet? Can it be calculated “mathematically”, by the same wrong “mathematics”?

Again, I said technology at times saves lives. Technology also created ways to kill people and bomb our Earth. Technology created new illnesses.

You do the math.
Is technology useful?

Again, I would call “science”, Be Careful Activity.
I would call technology, Be Careful Activity.

Let's talk about science

(1) There are questions I believe which will never get an answer. Nature protects itself, I believe.

(The point seems to suggest that nature does things on purpose, with intention; that we are ruled by nature (partially or totally); that nature (on its own, or together with some entity) has the final word. Here is what I have to say: one may interpret my point as one wishes.)

(2) I believe this book is factually correct.

11 sections of the book

This book has 11 sections:

1. There is 1 universe
2. I destroy “science”
3. Science
4. Weight
5. Gravity
6. Light
7. The universe cannot be divided
8. 10 points about science
9. Let’s destroy “science”
10. 1 is a prime number
11. The universe is infinite. The universe is everything that exists. Infinity = 1

1. <u>There is 1 universe</u>

There is 1 universe.

Let's see:

...There is no universe?

...No.

...There is total certainty that there is something. The universe is, everything, that exists. Someone can say, nothing exists. First, that comment is something. Second, it denies our existence. Third, it's a lie. Nothingness is a lie. There is total certainty there is something.

...The total certainty that there is something has consequences. For example, not everything is possible. It is impossible that there is, not, something!

...So we have one truth. Is the rest belief? I believe this book is factually correct.

...There could be nothingness in the future? Once something exists, you cannot have nothingness. You can call it nothingness, but what you have is "nothingness" + a past. That, is something.

...One can deny history, one can lie about history, but once something existed, even if history would be erasable, you can't get nothingness. One could say: a history and an anti-history could combine and make nothingness, and in this way you did get nothingness after something ceased to exist. I would say even then you don't get nothingness because something you call history and anti-history would have existed. You cannot get nothingness after something existed.

...There could have been nothingness in the past? Did the universe always exist?

...There could be more than 1 universe? Universes might be coming in and out of existence? For example, there might have been 2 universes yesterday, 5 universes now?

...Everything that exists is the universe: so if there were 2 universes, that is actually 1 universe; you miscounted. Everything...that exists is the universe. If there are 5 universes, again that is actually 1 universe.

...What about what doesn't exist? What doesn't exist, doesn't exit (except as a thought). Thoughts are part of the universe.

...What about what doesn't exist and hasn't been thought of? Again, that thought exists. Thoughts are part of the universe.

...What about things that don't exist yet? Tomorrow is no guarantee. (The thought, however, about things that don't exist yet, exists).

...What about things that existed? The universe is everything that -- exists. (The thought about the past, exists). Is the past gone?

...There could be less than 1 universe? There could be ½ a universe? Universes could have ceased to exist, and then started to exist, start/stop/start, etc., with nothingness in between?

...Again, the ½ universe is miscounted. Everything...that exists is the universe. It's not ½. It's 1 universe.

...Universes could have ceased to exist? Again, once something exists, you cannot have nothingness. You can call it nothingness, but what you have is "nothingness" + a past. That is something. There is 1 universe ("what exists" might be changing…Still, all that exists, is the universe).

...Could nothingness be outside the universe, or next to the universe, or inside the universe? There is no nothingness (except as a thought). The fact that there is something, means there is no nothingness.

...Can anything be outside the universe? That thoughts exists. Whether a thought is factually correct is another matter.

This book was written entirely and solely by me; all ideas herein are mine.

2. I destroy "science"

Science is mathematics. What is mathematics?
Science seeks to uncover truths.

Ok, we need a little joke. Here's a math joke. I did not invent this.
Dog math: two dogs are talking to each other. One dog asks, "If I have 5 bones and Mr. Jones takes away 4, how many fingers will he have left?"

And another joke. I did not invent this.
Dogma: the belief that wherever you are, whatever you are doing, a dog is watching you.

3. Science

Back to the universe.

(That sounds like the movie "Back to the Future"...which makes sense, since that movie talks about the spacetime continuum...which I have broken).

Back to the universe. There is 1 universe.

The universe is everything that exists. It is not only physical things.
The universe is everything that exists: physical + non-physical things + anything else, if it exists.

There is 1 physical universe.
(…For instance, if one thought there is more than 1 physical universe, then that was miscounted. Everything…that physically exists is the physical universe).

Here I start destroying "science":

Could a physical universe be completely surrounded/enclosed by a non-physical thing, which is completely surrounded/enclosed by another physical universe? In other words, a non-physical thing sandwiched in between 2 physical universes? First, everything that physically exists is the physical universe, so that was miscounted: it's not 2 physical universes, it's 1 physical universe. Second, the question can be re-phrased as: whether a non-physical thing can be sandwiched in between 2 physical things? The question is about whether there are gaps/holes in the physical universe, separating one physical thing from another physical thing -- it is the same question as whether, for example, there are holes in outer space…or holes at the sub-atomic level. It is the same question as whether there is a vacuum in the physical universe.

Let's answer like this:

(a) Would it be better to avoid answering the question on the void? No.

(b) If it turns out all non-physical things are actually physical things (…let's say, everything in the universe is actually only physical), then…non-physical things don't exist. In that case, there is no gap/hole in the physical universe, since…everything that exists is physical. Then the universe = physical universe.

> ...What about things outside the universe? That ("things outside the universe") is part of the 1 universe; everything that exists, is the universe.
>
> ...What about things that don't exist? Could they act as gaps/holes in the physical universe? Things that don't exist, don't exist (except as a thought). Thoughts are part of the universe.

(c) If non-physical things do exist (as I believe they do), then let's return to the initial question. Are there gaps/holes in the physical universe?...I believe non-physical things exist (for example, thoughts).

There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe. (Everything physical has volume, no matter what someone says). (Everything physical has mass). What is volume? That it occupies space. What is mass? That it has weight.

> ...It is said gluons and photons are particles without mass. I say, human beings lack the eyesight and tools to identify the mass.

(So…non-physical things don't have mass, don't have volume? Is there something else in the universe that is not physical, nor non-physical, that has mass, volume?...What is the mass of the universe?...I say everything physical has weight -- what is the weight of the physical universe? What is the weight of the universe? It is said weight is the force of a physical object due to gravity (W = mg) (W (weight) is said to be the product of m (mass of a physical object) and g (local gravitational acceleration) (for example, it is said that a physical object on the moon weighs about 1/6 as much as on Earth). I would say, the physical object has the same weight, although the weight is difficult to measure).

Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?

...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?
...Is anything only physical? Is anything only non-physical? Is anything only something else (meaning, not physical, nor non-physical)?

4. Weight

As I said, everything physical has volume, no matter what someone says. Everything physical has mass. What is volume? That it occupies space. What is mass? That it has weight.

I say a physical object with a certain mass always has the same weight. If you change the mass, you change the weight. That weight (how heavy something is) is difficult to measure.

> ...On the contrary, "science"/convention says that on Earth for example, one weighs more at sea level than at the top of a mountain because for example the gravitational force is not the same throughout the surface of the Earth (it is said for example, the gravitational force is stronger at sea level than at the top of a mountain; it is stronger at the poles than at the equator). According to convention, a simple way to lose weight is to travel to a part of the Earth where there is less gravity (no need for exercise, etc.) (…I'm kidding).

I say, the weight remains the same. It is said gravity gives weight to physical objects. That is wrong.

I say measuring weight accurately is difficult. For example, using human tools (scales) to measure a person's weight will indeed give different results on different parts of the surface of the Earth. If the weight of a physical object with a certain mass is always the same (as I say), how does one measure the correct weight? **Where is the correct weight?** I say a physical object with a certain mass has the same weight anywhere…Gravity does not give weight to physical objects. Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass, weight. Calculating the weight correctly is difficult.

…**I asked before, what is the weight of the physical universe? What is the weight of the universe? The universe is everything that exists: physical + non-physical things + anything else, if it exists. It is possible the universe weighs more than the physical universe.**

The moon has a weight. The Earth has a weight. Etc., everything physical has weight.

Is the weight of the universe unbearably heavy? (I'm kidding, it's a reference to that book ("unbearable lightness…", etc.)). Are there gods/God holding up the universe? But everything that exists is the universe…For those who believe: so gods are part of the universe. Are the gods all holding each other up?...For those who believe: Is God holding up the universe? The universe is defined as everything that exists, so….?

How does a universe that has weight…? How, where is it going? We're not falling.

What is the smallest thing in the universe? How many of them are there? How many were there yesterday? We don't know the answers to any of these three questions…Human beings split, divide, split…nature protects itself.

…Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass. **There are only three dimensions: length, width, height. (3 is a primary number) (4 is a composite number…).**

I asked, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else? In that case, is it incorrect to state that density is mass divided by volume? (As an example…I say the universe is: physical + non-physical things + anything else, if it exists. I speak of "things". Does for example a mosquito have a soul? If yes, is a mosquito only "physical"? If a mosquito has a soul, does the mosquito fit in the category "anything else, if it exists"? If it has a soul, is it factually incorrect to state that the density of the mosquito is mass divided by volume?...The point is, are there things that cannot be divided by something else?)

…Let's answer the initial question: Can a non-physical thing be sandwiched in between 2 physical things? If yes, wouldn't this create a gap/hole/vacuum/void in the physical universe….unless non-physical things also have mass, volume?...Could "anything else, if it exists" be sandwiched in between 2 physical things? The point is, is there a gap/hole in the physical universe? I say, there is no gap. I also say non-physical things exist, I believe (for example, thoughts).

> ...**There was an elementary particle that was announced in 2012.** (Elementary means it is unknown if it is composed of other particles). I say, whatever particle has been found, is big/huge/etc. Smaller exists. I am not saying endlessly smaller. Particles are there. There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe. I say, there is no emptiness between particles. It is said the particle announced in 2012 is an indication of a field that gives mass to some/all particles (in other words, some/all particles would otherwise be massless). This is wrong. It is said the particle gives mass to some/all particles. It does not. Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass.

The smaller…the more gravity. If you find a small "particle", it's not small. If you think you found something smaller, it's not small, it's huge. The fact that you found it means it's not small. There is smaller. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass.

So…can a non-physical thing be sandwiched in between 2 physical things? Yes I think so. A human being can be 1 thought away (or more precisely 999, 999, 999, 999… thoughts away) from understanding particle physics. That's an example of a non-physical thing (a thought) coming in between a human being (physical) and particles (physical).

5. Gravity

…It is said the force of gravitational attraction is proportional to the product of the two masses and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between them. No. The smaller…the more gravity.

...As I wrote, everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass.

...The smaller…the more gravity. If you find a small "particle", it's not small. If you think you found something smaller, it's not small, it's huge. The fact that you found it means it's not small. There is smaller. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass.

…It is said there are four fundamental forces in the physical universe: gravitational, electromagnetic, strong and weak. (4 is a composite number. I do not believe there are 4 fundamental forces). The gravitational force is said to act between masses; the electromagnetic force is said to act between electric charges; and the strong and weak forces are said to be nuclear forces, responsible for the interactions between sub-atomic particles. It is said a nuclear force acts between the protons and neutrons of atoms. It is said the strong force holds most of ordinary matter together, and binds neutrons and protons to create atomic nuclei. It is said the weak force is related to for example, radioactive decay.

..."Science"/convention says the strong force is the strongest of the four.

…It is speculated that an elementary particle without mass (graviton) is related to gravity…I said, every particle has volume; every particle has mass.

Special theory of relativity is nonsense.
Science seeks to uncover truths.

(a) The nonsense theory has two proposals: first, it speaks of a physical object at rest/stationary. That's wrong. Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe; for example, particles are moving; everything physical is moving. For example, our eyesight might see a train on a platform. That train is made of particles that are moving. We see one train; with better eyesight we would see particles moving, etc. Calculations from a physical object at rest are wrong; no physical object is at rest in the physical universe...In addition, is it possible to accurately count even a single physical object -- where does a physical object start, where does it end? A train for example is

made of moving particles -- where does the physical object ("train") start, where does it end? Where is the border of the physical object ("train")?

As I wrote: To say something is approximately true, you would have to know what is true; then you can see if you were approximately correct, or very incorrect (intentionally...or unintentionally misleading). I refuse to neglect the word "negligible". "Mathematicians" use it in "mathematics", "physicists" use it in "physics", some human beings use it (the word "negligible").

I believe finite objects exist. For example, I believe a train is a finite object. We, can, count things. Where is the border of 1 train?

> ...On another note: 1 train is 1 train; at the same time it's not 1 train because it's inside the universe, which is 1. Both are correct; one on its own, is false.
>
> > ...In other words, what numerical part of the universe does the train represent? For example, let's say Earth represents 1/5 of the universe. What numerical part of the universe does the train represent? (…It cannot be 1. It must be a positive real number less than 1).
> >
> > ...What does it matter? Is it impractical to view things in this way? We, can, divide the universe. We can also be aware of both truths. As I wrote, this does not mean we cannot count things. It's just not the whole truth. One truth (it's 1 train) without the other truth (it's not 1 train because the train is inside the universe, which is 1), misses part of the truth; one truth on its own is, false…So now, how do we know we are not missing another truth? This book is about science -- how do we know we are not missing a scientific truth?
> >
> > ...Science is mathematics. What is mathematics?
> >
> > ...What is science?

(b) Second, the nonsense theory speaks of the speed of light in a -- vacuum. There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe. There is no emptiness between particles.

The two proposals of the nonsense theory are wrong.

The nonsense theory says there are several consequences: for example time dilation, relativity of simultaneity, nothing is faster than the speed of light, length contraction, relativistic mass. They're all wrong. It is said they have been experimentally verified.

We'll comment one by one.

Time dilation. It is total nonsense.

Time is the same everywhere.
The nonsense theory says time slows down at high speeds. Time doesn't slow down at high speeds. Atomic clocks (considered to be the most accurate clocks)…are inaccurate. They are tools made by human beings. To be accurate…they would have to be…on time.

It is said special theory of relativity (nonsense theory), and general theory of relativity (which we'll call nonsense theory n.2), passed every test they have been subjected to. They have not been subjected to the right tests then.

I wrote: If the tools used to test/make measurements are inaccurate…they will keep inaccurately confirming what you inaccurately state.

Assuming truth exists, one might accidentally or intentionally bump into truth, a truth?

I wrote: there are only three dimensions (length, width, height).
(The nonsense theory says time and space cannot be defined separately from each other. That's wrong. It is possible to say time hasn't started yet.) (In any case, time and space can be defined separately.) (Relativity of simultaneity is wrong (the nonsense theory says that events that occur at the same time for one observer can occur at different times for another observer. The nonsense theory refers to this as "relativity of simultaneity"). The truth is that if something is simultaneous/happening at the same time, then it's simultaneous. If it's not simultaneous, then it's not simultaneous. If there is confusion, there's miscalculation.)

Time is absolute.
The speed of light is not an indication of how time behaves.
Gravity is not an indication of how time behaves.
The two proposals of the nonsense theory are wrong. **The nonsense theory is wrong.**

The equation we know, is false. **(The equation comes from the nonsense theory).**
$E = mc^2$ is false.

...E (means energy), m (means mass), c (means the speed of light in a -- vacuum). There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe: **"c" is false/fiction/invented.** There is no emptiness between particles.

...There is no energy. (It exists as a thought. It's not a factually correct thought). **"E" is false.**

...There is mass.

Let's talk about mass.

...I wrote: What is mass? That it has weight.

...I wrote: A physical object with a certain mass has the same weight anywhere…Gravity does not give weight to physical objects. Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass, weight. Calculating the weight correctly is difficult. For example, using human tools (scales) to measure a person's weight will indeed give different results on different parts of the surface of the Earth.

...I wrote: What is volume? That it occupies space. There are only three dimensions (length, width, height).

...I wrote: Do non-physical things have mass, have volume? Is there something else in the universe that is not physical, nor non-physical, that has mass, volume?

...Is anything only physical? Is anything only non-physical? Is anything only something else (meaning, not physical, nor non-physical)?

...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?

...I wrote: Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass.

...The smaller…the more gravity. If you find a small "particle", it's not small. If you think you found something smaller, it's not small, it's huge. The fact that you found it means it's not small. There is smaller. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass.

...I write: **Nonsense theory n.2 is, false.**

...The general theory of relativity (nonsense theory n.2) is, false. It's called "general" because it claims it "generalizes" special theory of relativity (nonsense theory) and Newton's law of universal gravitation. Nonsense theory n.2 claims it gives a unified theory of gravity, as a geometric property of space and time (spacetime). Nonsense theory n.2 claims the gravitational force (gravity) is the result of a curvature of space and time.

...All of this is wrong.

Actually: ...(1) The two proposals of the nonsense theory are wrong. The nonsense theory is wrong. Nonsense theory n.2 is "generalizing" a factually incorrect theory.

...(2) **Newton's "law" of universal gravitation is wrong.** Nonsense theory n.2 is "generalizing" a factually incorrect theory.

...I wrote: "it is said the force of gravitational attraction is proportional to the product of the two masses and inversely

proportional to the square of the distance between them". (That -- is **Newton's "law" of universal gravitation. The "law" is false.**) Another way to state Newton's "law" is that -- a particle attracts every other particle -- using a force that is directly proportional to the product of their masses and inversely proportional to the square of the distance between their centers. Newton's "law" is wrong.

...This is correct:

...The smaller…the more gravity.

...As I wrote, everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass.

...The smaller…the more gravity. If you find a small "particle", it's not small. If you think you found something smaller, it's not small, it's huge. The fact that you found it means it's not small. There is smaller. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass.

...(3) It is said nonsense theory n.2 has superseded/replaced Newton's "law" of universal gravitation.

...It is said Newton's "law" of universal gravitation is a good approximation of the effects of gravity. It is said nonsense theory is an approximation of nonsense theory n.2. It is said nonsense theory is valid for weak gravitational fields. In other words, nonsense theory n.2 is more precise. It is said nonsense theory n.2 is needed for extreme precision, or when dealing with very strong gravitational fields. All of this is wrong.

...As I wrote: to say something is approximately true, you would have to know what is true; then you can see if you were approximately correct, or very incorrect (intentionally...or unintentionally misleading). **Likewise, to say something is more approximately true, you would have to know what is true.**

... Newton's "law" of universal gravitation, nonsense theory, and nonsense theory n.2 have been experimentally verified? As I wrote: if the tools used to test/make measurements are inaccurate, they will keep inaccurately confirming what you inaccurately state.

...As I asked: assuming truth exists, one might accidentally or intentionally bump into truth, a truth?

...(4) Nonsense theory n.2 claims it gives a unified theory of gravity, as a geometric property of space and time (spacetime). Nonsense theory n.2 claims the gravitational force (gravity) is the result of a curvature of space and time. This is wrong.

...**There is no spacetime.**

AND HERE I BREAK THE SPACETIME CONTINUUM. 🌞

...What is the spacetime continuum?

...Nonsense theory and nonsense theory n.2 say there is something called spacetime.

...There are 4 dimensions.

...Spacetime (a "mathematical" model used in "physics") fuses three-dimensional space and the one dimension of time into a single four-dimensional continuum. This is the spacetime continuum.

...It is called a continuum because it is believed: there are no missing points in space or instants in time, and both can be subdivided without any limit in size or duration.

...All of this is wrong.

...This is correct:

...There is no spacetime.

...There is no continuum.

...There is no spacetime continuum.

...There are only three dimensions (length, width, height).

...As I said, the nonsense theory claims that time and space cannot be defined separately from each other. That's wrong. It is possible to say time hasn't started yet.

...However, saying that time hasn't started yet, denies our existence, our past/history, our present. We have a past/history, a present. Tomorrow is no guarantee.

...In any case, time and space can be defined separately. There are only three dimensions (length, width, height). Space is 3-dimensional. There is no spacetime (4 dimensions). There is no continuum. As I wrote, it is called a continuum because it is believed: there are no missing points in space or

instants in time, and both can be subdivided without any limit in size or duration.

> ...I wrote a mathematics manuscript. The manuscript is factually correct. It says there is a finite number of numbers. There is a largest positive number, a smallest positive number, a biggest negative number, and a smallest negative number.
>
> > ...It's wrong to state that space and time can be subdivided without any limit in size or duration.
> >
> > > ...Numbers don't get endlessly smaller or endlessly bigger.

...To conclude:

...There is no spacetime.
...There is no continuum.
...There is no spacetime continuum.

I have broken the spacetime continuum. ☀

Now I continue to destroy "science":

We discussed: time dilation (false), and relativity of simultaneity (false).

We started talking about the speed of light in a vacuum.
The truth is $E \neq mc^2$.

> ...E (means energy), m (means mass), c (means the speed of light in a -- vacuum). There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe: **"c" is false/fiction/invented.**

We continue here with nonsense theory's claims: nothing is faster than the speed of light, length contraction, relativistic mass.

With regard to nothing in the universe being faster than the speed of light…If it's the fastest, can a tool made by human beings really measure it accurately? (The value is said to be an exact value!) (The value is the speed of light in a -- vacuum. As I wrote, there is no vacuum. The value must be wrong. I asked: assuming truth exists, might one accidentally or intentionally bump into truth, a truth?)

> ...The value might be correct?
> ...I ask: does light have a speed?

With regard to length contraction, it is about what happens if a physical object moves close to the speed of light…The nonsense theory says it can be observed that the length of the physical object would decrease; the width and height would not change.

> ...I said, everything physical has volume. There are three dimensions: length, width, height. So, does the volume of a physical object decrease as it moves close to the speed of light, from any observer's point of view?...Also, what besides light, can travel at the speed of light? There is faster.

With regard to relativistic mass, it is about what happens if a physical object moves close to the speed of light…The nonsense theory says the mass of the object would increase. It is said an infinite amount of energy is needed to accelerate a physical object with mass to the speed of light. I say, it's happening (according to "science"): it is said the speed of light is the speed of a photon (…it is said a photon is a particle without mass) (I say, every physical object has mass. So, if the speed of light is the speed of a photon, then there is already a physical object with mass (a photon) moving at the speed of light)…I also say, whatever particle has been found, is big/huge/etc. Smaller exists. I am not saying endlessly smaller. Particles are there…If the speed of a photon is the speed of light, then there are many particles (with mass) (in a photon) that -- are -- the speed of light. (There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe; there is no emptiness between particles)…Which particle (among the particles in a photon) arrives first? It depends on the target. However is there a particle that is faster? In this race, what is the "starting line" and the "finish line"? Where is "start", where is "target"? If a particle has a good position in the queue (all the particles in a photon have a different "start" location), does the particle reach the "target" faster? (…Does this sound like biology?...The "race" towards…the egg?)

So the nonsense theory is saying…the volume of the photon decreases and its mass increases. There is no emptiness between particles. If the mass increases, the volume must increase.

> ...The nonsense theory says, however, if photons have mass, then the speed of a photon is not the speed of light. Then the speed of a photon is lower than the speed of light. According to the nonsense theory the speed of light is a limit beyond which nothing can go faster (the speed is constant in a vacuum).
>
> ... I asked: does light have a speed?

As a conclusion:

Let's say the nonsense theory (special theory of relativity) and nonsense theory n.2 (general theory of relativity) are wrong/factually incorrect. Does it matter? Don't the two nonsense theories "work"?

...The theory/"mathematics" behind the two nonsense theories is correct? No. It is garbage.

...First, it is wrong because "mathematics" is wrong. "Science" (for example, special theory of relativity and general theory of relativity) is based on factually incorrect "mathematics".

...Second, it is wrong because within "mathematics", it invents things to make it "work". For example, "c" is false/fiction/invented; "E" also doesn't exist (except as a thought. The thought is factually incorrect.) (The truth is $E \neq mc^2$).

...The practice behind the two nonsense theories "works"?

...First, with regard to experimental validation of the two nonsense theories, I wrote: if the tools used to test/make measurements are inaccurate, they will keep inaccurately confirming what you inaccurately state.

...Second, with regard to the practical application of the two nonsense theories (for example, technology), I wrote: You do the math. Does "science" "work"?

6. Light

Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?

There are questions I believe which will never get an answer.

7. The universe cannot be divided

The universe cannot be divided.

...It can, but when we do, it's not the entire truth. **Mathematics depends where you start.**

> ...For example, when you hold an eraser, you hold 1 eraser; at the same time, you do not hold 1 eraser because the eraser is inside/part of the universe, which is 1. Both truths are true at the same time; one on its own, is false. (I gave a similar example with a train).
>
> > ...This means the eraser could actually be 0.002, for example (meaning 2/1,000). In other words, what numerical part of the universe does the eraser represent? For example, let's say Earth represents 1/5 of the universe. What numerical part of the universe does the eraser represent? (…It cannot be 1. It must be a positive real number less than 1).
>
> ...What does it matter? Is it impractical to view things in this way? We, can, divide the universe. We can also be aware of both truths. As I wrote, this does not mean we cannot count things. It's just not the whole truth. One truth (you hold 1 eraser) without the other truth (you do not hold 1 eraser because the eraser is inside the universe, which is 1), misses part of the truth; one truth on its own is, false…**So now, how do we know we are not missing a mathematical truth? I answer: first, if you figure out prime numbers, then you figure out the rest of mathematics; second, the mathematics manuscript I wrote is necessary and sufficient to understand mathematics.**

8. 10 points about science

(1) There is 1 universe.

A gap/hole/void/vacuum in the physical universe is the same as there being nothingness. There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe; there is 1 physical universe.

The universe is everything that exists: physical + non-physical things + anything else, if it exists. There is no nothingness next door to something. There is 1 universe.

Nothingness, zero as a number is the same thing.

Zero (0) as a number is a lie. Nothingness is a lie.

(2) What is the smallest thing in the universe? How many of them are there? How many were there yesterday? We don't know the answers to any of these three questions.

(3) I say, everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass. There is no gap/hole/vacuum in the physical universe. There is no emptiness between particles. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass.

(4) Is anything only physical? Is anything only non-physical? Is anything only something else (meaning, not physical, nor non-physical)?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?…Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity? There are questions I believe which will never get an answer.

(5) Is everything in the physical universe made of particles? No. Is anything (physical, non-physical, other, any combination, etc.) everywhere? No.

…A physical universe made of particles (only) would not allow movement.
…A physical universe made of particles (only) would have gaps.

…Where in the physical universe is the physical universe not physical?
…Where in the physical universe are particles not?
…Where in the physical universe is light not?
…Where in the physical universe is gravity not?
…For those who believe: where in the physical universe are the gods not?

…For those who believe: where in the physical universe is God not?
…Where in the physical universe is the physical universe not?
…Where in the universe is the universe not?
…I say everything physical has weight. Where in the physical universe is weight not?

…Is there a scientific law that is everywhere? Does a scientific law exist?...A fact is everywhere?
…Everything physical is moving. Movement is everywhere in the physical universe?

…Is everywhere, everywhere?
…Is time, distance, speed, volume, mass, love…anything…anyone…everywhere (in the physical universe and/or in the universe)?

(6) I say, whatever particle has been found, is big/huge/etc. I say, smaller exists. I am not saying endlessly smaller. Particles are there.

(7) I say, everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass. The smaller…the more gravity. If you find a small particle, it's not small. If you think you found something smaller, it's not small, it's huge. The fact that you found it means it's not small.

(8) No two particles have exactly the same mass. No two particles have exactly the same volume. If you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there.

(9) No two particles move in exactly the same way. If you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there. Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe. This is true from any observer's point of view.

(10) Speed.

A 10-speed bicycle is fast.

Speed ("how fast").

…I asked, what besides light, can travel at the speed of light? There is faster.

This is an example of faster. I said, if you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there. I think they move faster.
No amount of money spent on tools will allow human beings to find a particle.
I think particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". They don't emit light.

…Is the speed of a photon the speed of light?
I don't think so.

…No two particles have the exact same speed. If you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there.

…A particle is not a wave; a wave is not a particle. There are particles in a wave. There is no wave in a particle.
Is everything in the physical universe made of particles? No.
A physical universe made of particles (only) would not allow movement.
A physical universe made of particles (only) would have gaps.

…No two particles move in exactly the same way. This is true, whether human beings observe them or not. It is true from any observer's point of view (even from the particle's "point of view". The particle can "see" it moves in a different way from surrounding particles. No particle can "see" all particles in the physical universe). No observer can see all particles in the physical universe (For those who believe: gods can? For those who believe: God can?).
Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe.
A particle, is, 1 particle.
A particle has 1 position/location in the physical universe. It has speed ("how fast"). No particle has the same position/location as another particle.

…Whatever particle human beings observed/observe, is not a particle. There is smaller; particles are there. A particle has a certain position and a certain speed. As stated above, no amount of money spent on tools will allow human beings to find a particle. **(Do you really think, with the way human beings treat nature, bombing it, etc., that nature will allow it?)** (Human beings split, divide, split…just like they divide the 1 Earth into countries.) (Nature protects itself, I believe).
Everything physical in the physical universe has a certain position, is moving. (With regard to the idea of an expanding universe, we'll return to this.) (With regard to everything physical moving, for example we see a train. With better eyesight we would see particles moving, etc.).

…In 1 particle, there are no other particles.
…A particle has 1 position/location in the physical universe. It has speed. 1 position/location means 1 position/location. It does not mean 2 positions/locations, etc.

…A particle has 1 position/location in the physical universe. It has speed. It moves. No two particles move in exactly the same way. Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe. A particle moves, changes position/location. No two particles have the exact same speed. No two particles have exactly the same mass. No two particles have exactly the same volume.

With regard to speed, I think a particle (for example by another particle): can be physically pushed to go faster, it can be physically slowed down. A particle has a minimum, maximum speed which is not the same as another particle.

…A human being has never seen/observed/found a particle. A particle, is, 1 particle. However, we see physical objects (for example, a table). A table is made of particles.

…A 10-speed bicycle is fast, as stated.
It is said there are four fundamental states of matter: solid, liquid, gas and plasma. (4 is a composite number. I do not believe there are 4 fundamental states). It is said there are many other states of matter.
How fast is a 10-speed bicycle?
It depends on who is riding the bike?

9. Let's destroy "science"

(1) I start with quantum mechanics.

Quantum mechanics is wrong. Totally.

What's factually incorrect with quantum mechanics? Everything.

What is quantum mechanics?
(a) Another name for quantum mechanics is quantum physics.
…This is wrong. Science seeks to uncover truths. Quantum mechanics is false. It is "science". It is "physics".
(b) It is the study of the very small.
…This is wrong. It is the study of the big/huge/etc. (I said, whatever particle has been found, is big/huge/etc. If you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there).
(c) It says that particles have a wave nature; waves have a particle nature.
…This is wrong. A human being has never seen a particle.
(d) It is based on mathematics.
…This is wrong. It is based on "mathematics". "Mathematics" is factually incorrect. There is only 1 correct mathematics.
(e) Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle states that, the more accurately you try to measure the position of a particle, the less accurately you can know the momentum; the more accurately you try to measure the momentum of a particle, the less accurately you can know the position.
…This is wrong. I said, a particle has a certain position and a certain speed. Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe. No two particles move in exactly the same way. No two particles have the exact same speed. A human being has never seen/observed/found a particle.
(f) Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle states that it's not possible to measure the momentum and position of a particle at the same time. This is not because the tools used to make measurements are inaccurate or accurate. This is also not because an observer can change what is observed (for example, by tools interfering with what is observed). This happens whether there is an observer or not. It happens because that is the way particles are (particles are particles; particles are also waves; it's not possible to measure the momentum and position at the same time, because a wave is not in one location but is spread out over space).
…This is wrong. There are particles in a wave. There is no wave in a particle. A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle. A particle, is, 1 particle.
(g) Quantum mechanics leads to uncertainty; it can provide rules to calculate probabilities, but not exact measurements. It has been suggested that, for example when measuring particles in and out of black holes, there is even more randomness.
…This is wrong. A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle. (If those are not particles that quantum "physicists" are observing, what are they observing? Rather, I say, what aren't they observing?).
(h) It has been suggested many (all possible) universes exist; this universe is one option. Particles (position, momentum) have many probabilities and line up in a certain way, which results in this world. Other universes are the result of particles lining up in a different way.

…This is wrong. A particle has a certain position and a certain speed. It is possible for someone to believe there are many universes -- it is miscounted (the universe is…everything…that exists) (so if there are for example 2 universes right now, that is actually 1 universe).
(i) Particles (position, momentum) have many probabilities (as shown by quantum mechanics, since a particle does not have a certain momentum and position at the same time). It has been suggested that we can walk through walls, if particles line up in a way to allow this. It has been suggested the probability of walking through a wall is low.
…This is wrong. Human beings cannot walk through walls. A particle has a certain position and a certain speed. Also, there is no emptiness between particles. There is no gap/hole/vacuum/void in the physical universe.
(j) Quantum mechanics says there is quantum tunneling and quantum entanglement.
…This is wrong. Quantum mechanics is wrong. It is not studying particles.
(k) Quantum mechanics works in practice (for example, electronic devices are made using quantum mechanics).
…As I wrote: Does "science" "work"?

(2) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with the Standard Model of particle physics.

The Standard Model is factually incorrect.

(It is said the main hole in the Standard Model is that it can only describe three of the four fundamental forces in the physical universe (not gravity). It is said the goal is to have a theory that unifies the Standard Model (which doesn't include gravity) with the general theory of relativity (which includes gravity). The Standard Model describes the physical universe on a small scale (atomic and sub-atomic particles). The general theory of relativity describes the physical universe on a big scale (for example, outer space)).
…I described gravity. I eliminated this hole.

Unify the Standard Model with the general theory of relativity? They're both wrong.

What is the Standard Model?
(a) It says there are four fundamental forces in the physical universe: gravitational, electromagnetic, strong and weak. As stated, the gravitational force is said to act between masses; the electromagnetic force is said to act between electric charges; and the strong and weak forces are said to be nuclear forces, responsible for the interactions between sub-atomic particles. It is said a nuclear force acts between the protons and neutrons of atoms. It is said the strong force holds most of ordinary matter together, and binds neutrons and protons to create atomic nuclei. It is said the weak force is related to for example, radioactive decay.
…This is wrong (4 is a composite number. I do not believe there are 4 fundamental forces).
(b) It describes all elementary particles that are known. (Elementary means it is unknown if they themselves are composed of other particles).
…This is wrong. The Standard Model doesn't describe particles. A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle. I said, whatever particle has been found, is big/huge/etc.

Smaller exists. I am not saying endlessly smaller. Particles are there. (This is not a matter of vocabulary/definitions of a particle. It is clear. Elementary particles, means it is unknown if they themselves are composed of other particles. It is known. If you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there. The fact that you found it means it's not small. The fact that you found it means it's not a particle.) (An atom in Greek means "indivisible". Should particles then be renamed? I said in 1 particle, there are no other particles. Should particles be renamed as atoms? No. Personally, I don't think particles should be renamed. Human beings split, divided, split…the atom. We don't erase history).

There are more points about the Standard Model.

(c) It describes three of the four fundamental forces (not gravity): electromagnetic, strong and weak. It says force carriers (gauge bosons) (particles) carry/are responsible for three fundamental forces: electromagnetic, strong and weak. With regard to gravity, as stated, it is speculated that a particle (graviton) carries/is responsible for gravity. (Speculated means there is no experimental evidence for this.) (There is no mathematical theory of gravity on a small scale (atomic and sub-atomic particles). This is why the Standard Model describes only three of the four fundamental forces (not gravity). This is the hole mentioned at the start of this discussion on the Standard Model).
…This is wrong. No particle is responsible for a force. No particle carries a force.
(d) As stated, the Standard Model describes three of the four fundamental forces (not gravity): electromagnetic, strong and weak. It describes the physical universe on a small scale (atomic and sub-atomic particles). It says the strong force is the strongest of the four. Next, the electromagnetic force. Next, the weak force (stronger than gravity, but weak compared to the strong force and the electromagnetic force). And in last place? Gravity.
…This is wrong (4 is a composite number. I do not believe there are 4 fundamental forces). Also, it incorrectly describes the physical universe on a small scale. I said, everything physical has volume, everything physical has mass: the smaller…the more gravity. If you find a small "particle", it's not small. If you think you found something smaller, it's not small, it's huge. The fact that you found it means it's not small. There is smaller.

…I said above, no particle is responsible for a force; no particle carries a force. I said, everything physical has volume, everything physical has mass: the smaller…the more gravity.
…Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?

…Where is gravity greatest in the physical universe? I said, no two particles have exactly the same mass; no two particles have exactly the same volume. There is 1 smallest particle in the physical universe? That smallest particle has greatest gravity?
…The smallest particle must be staying in one place? We don't see the world drastically shifting, with physical objects suddenly moving all over the place. The smallest particle must be moving, since everything physical is moving in the physical universe?
…What about other particles with greater mass? They are scattered in the physical universe? They have less gravity? The particles are scattered in the physical universe in such a way so that there is balance?

…On another note. I said, the smaller…the more gravity. This means the bigger, the less gravity? I didn't say that -- physically the biggest, is the physical universe. The physical universe is everything that physically exists. So, the bigger the particle, the less gravity?

…We return here to what I said.
…Is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?…Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?
…I said, in 1 particle, there are no other particles…The same questions: Is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially…

…I said, a particle has 1 position/location in the physical universe. A particle has a minimum, maximum speed which is not the same as another particle. I said, no two particles have exactly the same mass; no two particles have exactly the same volume. Does the mass change?
…On another note. Do particles come in and out of existence? Does the mass change, for example disappearing?

…And so, we return to this point: What is the smallest thing in the universe? How many of them are there? How many were there yesterday?

> ...You say the smallest "thing" is the 1 smallest particle (it has the smallest mass, smallest volume, according to what I say)?...I say, is the smallest "thing" non-physical, physical, partially…?

(e) The Standard Model says the four fundamental forces vary in strength, as stated. They vary also in range. Gravity has infinite range (it's everywhere; it's universal (universal means everywhere)). The electromagnetic force has infinite range (it's everywhere; it's universal). The strong and weak forces only have short range; they dominate only on a small scale (atomic and sub-atomic particles).
…This is wrong (4 is a composite number. I do not believe there are 4 fundamental forces).
…Also, we return to what I said. Is anything everywhere? No.

…I asked, where in the physical universe is gravity not?
…Is everything in the physical universe made of particles? No. A physical universe made of particles (only) would not allow movement. A physical universe made of particles (only) would have gaps…The same questions: Is anything only physical?... Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?
…Where in the physical universe is the physical universe not physical?...The same questions: Is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially…
…Is there a scientific law that is everywhere? Does a scientific law exist?...A fact is everywhere?
…Is everywhere, everywhere? No. It's not right here.
…Is time, distance, speed, volume, mass, love…anything…anyone…everywhere (in the physical universe and/or in the universe)? Love? Show me 1 country full of love.

… Is anything everywhere (in the physical universe and/or in the universe)? No. We're not gravity; we're not movement; we're not a scientific law; we're not a fact; we're not particles; we're not weight. We exist. We're individuals. We're human beings.

…On another note. Everything physical is moving in the physical universe. If nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe, everything is working? Everything is constantly working? No, sometimes human beings go on holiday. Is, for example, a particle in a table always working? Kind of like a slave, a particle has a certain position/location, a certain speed, and always has to work?...Someone says, a particle doesn't "feel" so it would never know it's a slave? Still, the question is valid, I say.
…I think -- the universe -- has no slaves.
…It has been suggested we might be marionettes/puppets controlled by something, etc.
…The universe has no slaves.
…Human beings do that. They have slaves, sometimes.

...I asked, where in the physical universe is the physical universe not? Where in the universe is the universe not? I say, for example the physical universe is not inside a mosquito; the universe is not inside a mosquito.

…On another note. For example, is gravity in the human body?...I say, are human beings made of particles? Is a giraffe made of particles? Are micro-organisms made of particles? No.
…Someone says, cells are made of atoms? Someone says, are particles always inside atoms?...I say, there is no particle in a human being, a giraffe, micro-organisms…

…On another note, "science"/convention says the universe is about 13.8 billion years old.
…The physical universe should be aired a bit? Get some fresh air in? Someone should open a window in the physical universe and get some new, fresh air in?
…The universe is renewed all the time, human beings pollute (the Earth and outer space)?

…On another note. Does a scientific law exist?...I believe this book is factually correct. My mathematics manuscript proposes to be correct. Science is mathematics.

…On another note. Is change everywhere? Everything changes?
…I say: nothing is changing.
…The day human beings treat each other well, that will be a change. Until then everything you call "change" is not change. It might look like change, but it's not (whether it's in outer space, for example a galaxy apparently moving further away; or whether it's on Earth, for example the weather "changing"). If something is always "changing" it's actually not "changing", it's remaining constant. Change would be if it suddenly -- didn't change! I tell you, the only change would be if human beings treat each other well.

(3) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with the particle announced in 2012.

I described the particle (it's called Higgs boson; Higgs particle), towards the end of section 4 of the book on "weight".

As stated above, the Standard Model describes all elementary particles that are known (including the Higgs boson, an elementary particle).
…This is wrong. As I said, the Standard Model doesn't describe particles. A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle.

What is the Higgs boson about?
(a) The Higgs boson is an elementary particle. (Elementary means it is unknown if it is composed of other particles). It is said the particle (Higgs boson) is an indication of a Higgs field that gives mass to some/all particles (in other words, some/all particles would otherwise be massless). It is said the particle (Higgs boson) gives mass to some/all particles.
…This is wrong. No field, no particle, gives mass to particles. Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass. A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle. The particle (Higgs boson) (which is not a particle) is the most expensive "particle" in history (for example, money spent on tools to "discover" it in 2012 at CERN's Large Hadron Collider) (CERN, Conseil Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire; European Organization for Nuclear Research).
(b) The Higgs Field permeates the physical universe. (Permeates means universal, everywhere).
…This is wrong. Is anything everywhere? No.

(4) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with nonsense theory and nonsense theory n.2.

The nonsense theory (special theory of relativity) and nonsense theory n.2 (general theory of relativity) were described.

Special theory of relativity and general theory of relativity are factually incorrect.

Here are some points. (The book discussed this topic already). What do the theories say?
(a) There is something called spacetime.
…This is wrong. As stated, there are only three dimensions: length, width, height.
(b) Spacetime can be curved.
…This is wrong. There is no spacetime.
(c) The speed of light is constant in a vacuum.
…This is wrong. (The book discussed this topic).
...As stated, $E \neq mc^2$.
(d) Light behaves as a particle and as a wave.
…This is wrong. It is said the speed of light is the speed of a photon. I asked, does light have a speed?
...It is said a photon is a particle without mass. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass.
...It is said a photon is a particle. It is said particles have a wave nature; waves have a particle nature. A particle is not a wave; a wave is not a particle. There are particles in a wave. There is no wave in a particle.
...Also, a human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle.
(e) There is something called energy.

…This is wrong. There is no energy.
(f) The mass-energy equivalence says anything that has mass has an equivalent amount of energy, and anything that has energy has an equivalent amount of mass.
…This is wrong. This is the equation we know. It's false.
…A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle. I say, every particle has volume; every particle has mass. A particle has 1 position/location in the physical universe. It has speed…There is no energy.
(g) The general theory of relativity describes gravity: not as a force, but as a result of the curvature of spacetime caused by the uneven distribution of mass, energy.
….This is wrong. There is no spacetime. There is no energy.
…It is said nonsense theory n.2 (general theory of relativity) most accurately describes gravity in science. Nonsense theory n.2 is factually incorrect.
…"Science"/convention says all types of energy (this includes light) cause gravity and are affected by gravity, since energy and mass are equivalent…This is wrong. There is no energy.
…"Science"/convention says there are various types of energy. They might include: kinetic, potential, mechanical, electric, magnetic, gravitational, chemical, ionization, nuclear, chromodynamic, elastic, mechanical wave, sound wave, radiant, rest, and thermal energy…There is no energy.

(5) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with the speed of light in a vacuum.

"Science"/convention says the speed of light in a vacuum is constant.
This is factually incorrect. (The book discussed this topic).

It is said light is energy, matter, behaves as a wave, behaves as a particle.
I said, there is no energy. Also, a particle is not a wave; a wave is not a particle. There are particles in a wave. There is no wave in a particle.
I said, do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?

Here are more points on what is said.
(a) Light has a speed.
…I say, the "speed of light in a vacuum" is not a high speed (the value is said to be an exact value). I said, there is faster. If you find a particle, it's not a particle: there is smaller; particles are there. No amount of money spent on tools will allow human beings to find a particle. I think particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". They don't emit light.
...In the past, it was said light is instantaneous/immediate (light can travel any distance in no time at all). Does light have a speed? Is light, light? Speed, speed?
(b) The speed of light in a vacuum is constant (vacuum means not a total vacuum, but almost a total vacuum).
…I said, there is no vacuum in the physical universe. With regard to "almost a total vacuum", how do you know it's "almost" a vacuum? What does a vacuum look like? There is no vacuum in the physical universe. As I said, to say something is approximately true, you would have to know what

is true; then you can see if you were approximately correct, or very incorrect (intentionally…or unintentionally misleading).
…As I asked, assuming truth exists, might one accidentally or intentionally bump into truth, a truth?
…Again, does light have a speed?
(c) The speed of a photon is the speed of light.
…As I wrote, I don't think so.
…Is a photon related to light?
…I said, I think particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". They don't emit light.
...On another note, I asked, what besides light, can travel at the speed of light? Again, does light have a speed?...Is there a gap in speeds? Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe. From faster to faster, are there things (physical, non-physical, other, any combination, etc.) that are fast, then there's a gap in speeds (no things exist, that can travel at those speeds), then suddenly there's the "speed of light in a vacuum"? Or, do all speeds exist?...As said, I think particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". I think, a particle has a minimum, maximum speed which is not the same as another particle. The minimum speed is faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum".
(d) When we look at the stars, we see the past.
…I said, the speed of light is not an indication of how time behaves. Gravity is not an indication of how time behaves. Time is absolute. Again, does light have a speed?
…"Science"/convention says when we look at the sun from Earth, we see how the sun was about 8 minutes, 20 seconds ago. When we look at the moon, we see how the moon was about 1.3 seconds ago. Even the light we see from physical objects nearby is said to be a bit delayed (for example, if we speak to someone about one meter away, the light from the person's face took about 3.336 nanoseconds to get to us).
…Are we always seeing the past?
…Do we look at the sky and experience the present and past at the same time?
…Do we co-exist with the past?
…Where is the "border" of the present/past from Earth?..."The sky's the limit"? The sky…is the limit?...(However, "science"/convention says even the light we see from physical objects nearby is a bit delayed. In that case, the "border" between present and past, from an individual's point of view, is anything that is not them? Anything an individual looks at will have light that gets to them with a bit of delay? Also, it takes time for the image to be processed (for example, by our eyes, different parts of our body) before we see the image, which means more delay?

…Is time not about when an image reaches us, but when an odor reaches us? Is time dependent on sight, hearing, smell, taste, and/or touch/feeling, something else, any combination of these? Should time be based only on sight? On the "speed of a photon"? As I asked, is a photon related to light? Is time dependent on light?
…"Science"/convention says the "speed of light in a vacuum" is constant. There is no vacuum. Also, I said a particle has a certain position and a certain speed. No two particles have the exact same speed. A particle has a minimum, maximum speed which is not the same as another particle. No particle has the same position/location as another particle. No two particles move in exactly the same way. I said particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". They don't emit light.

…It has been suggested, time is an illusion. It has been suggested only the present exists (not the past, future).
…I said, it is possible to say time hasn't started yet. This denies our existence, our past/history, our present. We have a past/history, a present. Tomorrow is no guarantee.

…I said, time is absolute. It is the same everywhere…**When we look at stars, we don't see the past.**

…Time is the same everywhere. This does not mean time is, everywhere. For example, it's not in a photon.

(6) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with the four fundamental states of matter.

It matters.
Why? Why does anything matter?

What are the four fundamental states of matter?
(a) As stated, it is said there are four fundamental states of matter: solid, liquid, gas and plasma. (It is said, examples of plasma are lightning, electric sparks, neon lights, plasma TV; plasmas are electrically conductive). It is said there are many other states of matter.
…This is wrong (4 is a composite number. I do not believe there are 4 fundamental states).
…With regard to there being many states of matter, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?
(b) In a solid, particles don't move much; they only vibrate. In a liquid, particles move more. In a gas, particles move even more, and faster.
…This is wrong. A human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle. I said, everything physical has volume, everything physical has mass: the smaller…the more gravity. I said, no two particles have the exact same speed.
…Are particles really faster in a gas than in a solid?
…**Is gravity between particles in a solid greater than gravity between particles in a gas?**
…We return to the 10-speed bicycle I talked about at the start and end of comment (10) above on speed, in section 8 of the book on "10 points about science". (Now I'll think of 8 things to say 🌞) (I'm kidding, but I thought I should balance out the number of times I say "10" and "8" here).

…A 10-speed bicycle is fast. How fast?... It depends on who is riding the bike?

…"Science"/convention says a 10-speed bicycle is an example of a solid.
…As I said, no two particles have the exact same speed. A bicycle is made of particles. What is the speed of every particle in the bicycle? As stated, I think particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". They don't emit light.
…As stated, I think a particle (for example by another particle): can be physically pushed to go faster, it can be physically slowed down. A particle has a minimum, maximum speed which is not the same as another particle. The minimum speed is faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum".

…If someone rides the bike, do some/all particles in the bike get slowed down (for example, by air)? Do some/all particles in the bike move faster, with particles bumping into each other? Is the speed of every particle in the bike unaffected by whether someone is riding it or not? As stated, a human being has never seen/observed/measured a particle.
…As a conclusion, a 10-speed bicycle is fast. Every particle in the bicycle is faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum".

…We return to section 7 of the book on "The universe cannot be divided". I wrote about counting 1 eraser. "Science"/convention says an eraser is an example of a solid.

> …I said, particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". An eraser is made of particles.
> …I say we can count things. When you hold an eraser, for example, you hold 1 eraser; at the same time, you do not hold 1 eraser because the eraser is inside/part of the universe, which is 1. Both are correct; one on its own, is false. (I gave a similar example with a train).
> …Where is the border of the object ("eraser")? An eraser is made of moving particles -- where does the physical object ("eraser") start, where does it end? Is it possible to accurately count even a single physical object? How many micro-organisms (for example, bacteria) are inside/on the eraser? Were the micro-organisms included when we counted 1 eraser? Is it so difficult to count, we're just trying to count 1, we haven't even gotten to 2, 3, 4, 5, 6…?.
> …I answer, with regard to unclear borders of, for example an object, whatever exists is counted; if it turns out it doesn't exist (then it exists as a thought).
> ...As I said, I believe finite objects exist. For example, I believe an eraser is a finite object. We, can, count things: for instance, 1 eraser.

(7) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with Newton's three laws of motion.

Newton's three laws of motion are factually incorrect.

It is said the special theory of relativity (nonsense theory) and general theory of relativity (nonsense theory n.2) are more accurate than Newton's three laws of motion.
…This is wrong.
…The nonsense theory and nonsense theory n.2 are factually incorrect.

Again, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?…Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?

The topic of speed was discussed.
Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe.
Comment (6)(b) above on the fundamental states of matter discusses a 10-speed bicycle, relevant to the topic here in comment (7). For example, we see one bicycle (one object). With better eyesight, we would see particles moving, etc.

Comment 2(a) above on the Standard Model of particle physics discusses forces.
Newton speaks of forces.
Newton's "law" of universal gravitation says all objects exert a pull on other objects.
…This is wrong. (This "law" was discussed).

Newton's "science" is wrong. This book is about science.
Science is mathematics. I wrote a mathematics manuscript. The manuscript is necessary and sufficient to understand mathematics.

(8) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with distance, time and speed.

Speed is speed. Distance is distance. Time is time. Speed is not distance divided by time.

"Science"/convention says speed is distance divided by time.
…This is wrong.

The topic of speed was discussed.
Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe.
Comment (6)(b) above on the fundamental states of matter discusses a 10-speed bicycle, relevant to the topic here in comment (8). For example, we see one bicycle (one object). With better eyesight, we would see particles moving, etc. A 10-speed bicycle is fast. How fast?...A bicycle is made of particles. What is the speed of every particle in the bicycle? Every particle in the bicycle is faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum".

Everything physical is moving.
Again, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?…Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?
…Again, does light have a speed?

Again, I say there is no particle in a human being, a giraffe, micro-organisms…
…What is the speed of a human being running the mile (1.6 km) race?

Let's look at distance.
Distance is absolute.
Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe.
…Is the physical universe moving? Everything…that physically exists is the 1 physical universe. Everything physical is moving; in this sense, the physical universe, is, moving…What about the "border" of the physical universe? Does the "border" change? (As stated, with regard to the idea of an expanding universe, we'll return to this).
…Everything physical inside/part of the physical universe is moving -- is the whole physical universe moving? This question is not about whether the physical universe has a border or not; it is not about whether the physical universe is expanding or not.

Although everything physical inside/part of the physical universe is moving, it is possible the physical universe as a whole is not moving. The "outer edges" of the physical universe are moving, so wouldn't the whole physical universe move, too? I think the physical universe as a whole is not moving.
Let's look at distance some more.
I say, distance is the length between two points in the physical universe. It is absolute.

Someone wants to measure distance?
…Everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass. Everything physical is moving. No two particles move in exactly the same way (it is true from any observer's point of view).
…the Earth is rotating, particles are moving, etc.
…The distance (the length between two points in the physical universe) that you wanted to measure has changed, because nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe. Now there's a different absolute distance between the two points. When a physical object tries to move from one point to another point (in other words, tries to travel that distance), the two points have changed position in the physical universe!
…This is true for any two points in the physical universe.

Speed is not distance divided by time.
…The distance (that you wanted to measure) now is bigger? Smaller? Later, the distance can return to the original distance, if the two points in the physical universe return to the exact original location? But then the distance changes again. Nothing physical is at rest in the physical universe.
For those who believe: Is God moving?
For those who believe: the gods move?

I say measuring distance accurately is difficult.
…How about measuring a mile (1.6 km) on Earth? The Earth is moving, for example rotating. Particles are moving, etc. A mile (1.6 km) is a distance. Measuring it correctly is difficult.
…How about measuring the distance between two tables? Again, we see two tables. With better eyesight we would see particles moving, etc. A table is made of particles. Particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum". Where is the border of the object ("table")?...I say, measuring distance correctly is difficult.

Let's look at time.
Time is absolute. It is the same everywhere.
…For example, when you make a phonecall in Mongolia to someone in Belgium, you're not calling from the future!
…**We have time zones. Actually, it's the same time everywhere on Earth. It's the same time everywhere in the universe.**

Let's return to the question towards the start of this comment (8). What is the speed of a human being running the mile (1.6 km) race?
…"Science"/convention says it is distance (1.6 km) divided by time. I say, this is wrong.
…I say, measuring distance correctly is difficult.
…I said, atomic clocks (considered to be the most accurate clocks) are inaccurate.

…We can sometimes see one person is faster than another person running the mile. What is the speed?
…On another note. What about someone driving a car. What's the speed of the car?…This is the same question as how fast is a 10-speed bicycle if someone is riding it. We see one car (one object). The car is made of particles. When you tried to measure the speed of the moving car, did you under-include, over-include the border of the object ("car")? Also, particles move faster than the "speed of light in a vacuum".
…We return to the question above. As I wrote, there is no particle in a human being.

I say, speed is speed. Distance is distance. Time is time.

Speed ("how fast").
…I asked, are there things that cannot be divided by something else? For example, can distance be divided by time? No.
…Can mass be divided by volume? No. "Science"/convention says density is mass divided by volume. I say, everything physical has volume; everything physical has mass. Again, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?…Do physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?
…In 1 particle, there are no other particles. Again, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else? In that case, is it factually incorrect to state that density is mass divided by volume?
…With regard to volume also, as stated, we see for example one physical object. With better eyesight we would see particles moving, etc. When trying to measure volume, did you under-include, over-include the border of the physical object?
…Volume is volume; mass is mass. As stated, what is volume? That it occupies space. What is mass? That it has weight…I said a physical object with a certain mass always has the same weight. If you change the mass, you change the weight. That weight (how heavy something is) is difficult to measure. It is said gravity gives weight to physical objects. That is wrong.

... **Archimedes' "science" is wrong. This book is about science.**

...For example, it is said Archimedes "discovered" a way to determine the volume of an object with an irregular shape. His "discovery" is wrong. It is said he calculated density. This is wrong.

...The topic of volume was discussed above.

...The topic of density was discussed above.

...Science is mathematics. I wrote a mathematics manuscript. The manuscript is necessary and sufficient to understand mathematics.

Again, to say something is approximately true (or more approximately true), you would have to know what is true.

(9) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with scientific predictions.

"Science"/convention says it makes predictions.
Whether "science" is useful or "works", was discussed.

Can "science" predict things?

On another note. It is said, that dropping a rock hammer (a rock hammer is used to break rocks) and a feather on the moon (for example from shoulder height), will make both objects land at the same time. It is said that this was predicted and experimentally shown.
…I say, measuring distance correctly is difficult. For example, it is difficult to release the hammer and feather from exactly the same height.
…Measuring exactly which object lands first, is difficult.
…I say, the hammer and feather on the moon would not land at the same time. The hammer will land first.

(10) Let's destroy "science". I continue, with "scientific laws".

Here are examples of "scientific laws":
"laws" of thermodynamics.

10. 1 is a prime number

It is.

I say, mathematics depends where you start. You can start from inside the universe and count things that exist inside the universe; or you can start from 1 universe.

If you start from 1 universe, the largest known prime number is 1.

11. <u>The universe is infinite. The universe is everything that exists. Infinity = 1</u>

The universe is infinite. The universe is everything that exists. There is nothing bigger than the universe.

I wrote:

> ...Infinity concerns the boundless, endless; something that has no end.
> ...I say, we need to distinguish between boundless, endless, big, small.
> ...Infinity is about what I said: if you can find something bigger than what you thought was the biggest, then what you found before wasn't infinity.

This section is about infinity: it's quite short…which is kind of weird, since we're talking about infinity! Then again...is anything endless?

Let's look at boundless, endless, big, small.

(a) Boundless means boundless. Otherwise, we're talking about something that is in some way -- bounded.

> ...If something is boundless, it cannot be more boundless. If something is found that is more boundless, then the previous thing simply wasn't boundless; it was mistakenly called boundless.
> ...I wrote, the total certainty that there is something has consequences. For example, not everything is possible. It is impossible that there is, not, something!...**<u>Thus, the universe is bounded in some way: not everything is possible.</u>**

(b) What about the finite in the infinite? The infinite in the finite?

> (1) Can something finite have something infinite inside it? No.
> ...The universe is infinite.
> ...Something finite doesn't have the infinite universe inside it.
> ...Is anything else infinite besides the universe? The universe is everything that exists. There is nothing else. Only the universe is infinite.
>
> (2) Can something infinite have something finite inside it? Inside the infinite universe, is anything finite? I believe finite objects exist. For example, the number of prime numbers is finite.
> ...I wrote a mathematics manuscript. The manuscript is necessary and sufficient to understand mathematics.
> ...Numbers don't get endlessly smaller or endlessly bigger. There is a finite number of numbers. Whether a particular number is endless or not, is another matter.
>
> (3) Does endlessness exist? Yes.
> ...For example, it exists as a thought. Is it a factually correct thought?

(c) Let's look at whether something is endless.

(1) Is the infinite universe endless?

...Endless in time?

...Is time endless?

...Numbers don't get endlessly smaller or endlessly bigger. There is a largest positive number, and a smallest positive number. There is a smallest negative number and a biggest negative number.

...Is time not endless in the future (since there is a limited number of numbers to count time)?

...Is time a physical thing, a non-physical thing, neither, both, something else, combination...? What's older, time or the universe? Time or the physical universe?

...Once something exists, it exists forever?

...If someone is born later, did their eternity start later than someone born before?

...Is anything immortal? Or rather, is anything mortal?

...Endless in some other way?

...I don't believe the physical universe is expanding (as is claimed).

...I think the physical universe is finite. I think the universe is infinite. (The universe is everything that exists. It is not only physical things).

...The universe is everything that exists. There is nothing bigger than the universe. The universe is infinite. Only the universe is infinite.

...Does the size of the 1 infinite universe change? Is the universe expanding, for example? Was the universe bigger yesterday? Can the infinite universe get infinit-er? More infinite?

...I answer, infinity is infinity, and it is always the same size. In fact it is a number, 1. The total number of things that exist in the universe might be changing or not, increasing or decreasing. ("What exists" might be changing…Still, all that exists, is the universe). Something cannot be more infinite, or less infinite. It is either infinite, or not. The universe is everything that exists; nothing is bigger than the universe. The universe is infinite.

...Infinity =1.

...As I wrote, mathematics depends where you start. You can start from inside the universe and count things that exist inside the universe; or you can start from 1 universe. (Both are correct; one on its own, is false). If you start by counting what exists in the universe, you have a universe of unknown size. If you start with 1 universe, we know the size: it is 1. It is always 1.

...Infinity = 1. (There is nothing bigger than the universe). The universe is infinite.

...Infinity is infinity, and it is always the same size, 1. Does the size of 1 change?

...There is only one infinity: those of real numbers, which includes all numbers that exist.

...The size of the number line for positive numbers does not expand, or contract. (Also, the size of the number line for negative numbers does not expand, or contract). A number/some numbers, didn't suddenly start existing later; nor did any number ever cease to exist. I believe all numbers came into existence at the same time.

...I'm saying the exact opposite of what convention says: convention says infinity is a concept, zero is a number. I'm saying infinity is a number, zero is a concept.

...As I wrote (comment (1) of section 8 of the book on "10 points about science"): nothingness, zero as a number is the same thing.

...Zero (0) as a number is a lie. Nothingness is a lie.

- Infinity is a number; it is the same sort of number as natural or real numbers.

And this is how my science book shows, "There is 1 universe. It cannot be divided. 1 is a prime number. The universe is infinite. The universe is everything that exists. Infinity = 1".

(2) Is the physical universe endless?

...Endless in time?

...Endless in some other way?

...Is the entire physical universe endless, physically?

...I don't think so.

...I don't believe the physical universe is physically endless in all directions, nor in any direction. I don't think the physical universe (or a specific physical part) is physically endlessly big; nor do I think the physical universe (or a specific physical part) is physically endlessly small (I said whatever particle has been found, is big/huge/etc. Smaller exists. I am not saying endlessly smaller. Particles are there. Every particle has volume; every particle has mass). (I asked, do particles come in and out of existence? Does the mass change, for example disappearing?)

...Everything that physically exists is the 1 physical universe. (As I said, is anything only physical?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?…Do

physical things exist? How does one identify a physical thing? Is light a physical thing? Is gravity?).

...(I say, there is no particle in a human being, a giraffe, micro-organisms…).

...I said, I don't think the physical universe (or a specific physical part) is physically endlessly small. This means the universe (as a whole) is not endlessly small either. The universe is everything that exists. (...Is part of the universe endlessly small? Again, what is the smallest thing in the universe? How many of them are there? How many were there yesterday? We don't know the answers to any of these three questions).

...What about the past? Could a specific physical part of the physical universe, or the entire physical universe, have been physically endless, and then later not? I don't think so. What about the future?...We do not know the future.

...I don't think the physical universe is expanding...What about the future? We do not know the future. What about the past? For those whole believe: Has God told us? Has God not told us?...For those who believe: the gods told us? The gods have not told us?...In the past, the physical universe expanded, contracted, then re-expanded, etc., some combination/combinations? I don't think the physical universe is expanding, or contracting/getting smaller.

...The idea of an expanding, or contracting, physical universe is the idea of the "border" of the physical universe changing. The physical universe might have a border, or not...For those who believe: where are the gods?...For those who believe: Where is God? The universe is everything that exists, where inside the universe is God? Inside and outside? Sometimes inside, sometimes outside?...For those who believe: are the gods outside the universe?...For those who believe: Is God outside the universe? But the universe is defined as everything that exists. If the physical universe is finite, could one stick out one's hand and touch God?

...Here are more points on whether the physical universe is expanding, or expanded at any point in the past.

...I said, I don't think the physical universe is expanding. What about the past?

...First: does the total number of things that physically exist change over time? If the total number increases/decreases, the physical universe is bigger/smaller?...If the total number increases/decreases, the "border" of the physical universe changes? In other words, if the total number

increases/decreases, the physical universe expands/contracts?

...Second: Is the "border" of the physical universe unaffected by the total number of things that physically exist? In other words, does the total number not affect whether the physical universe is expanding or not?

...I think so. Unaffected. If the number of physical things increases, does this mean it went beyond/outside the physical universe? I don't think so. Everything that physically exists is inside/part of the 1 physical universe. The size of the 1 physical universe changes? I said, I don't think the physical universe is expanding, or contracting.

...Let's talk more about the past of the physical universe.

...The universe is everything that exists: physical + non-physical things + anything else, if it exists.

...Is it possible for the physical universe to be older than the universe? No. The universe is everything that exists. It's possible for the universe = physical universe. (I believe, non-physical things exist (for example, thoughts). As stated, if it turns out thoughts (or anything else) are actually physical things, then they're part of the physical universe. Everything that physically exists is the 1 physical universe.

...Is it possible for the universe to be older than, for example physical things? What about life, did life appear first in the universe or non-life? (Whatever "scientists" have said, they don't know the past of the whole physical universe, or universe).

...Let's talk more about the age of the physical universe and universe. (Hopefully, the physical universe and/or universe is not blushing when we talk about age).

...As stated, "science"/convention says the universe is about 13.8 billion years old.

..."Science"/convention says the Earth is about 4.5 billion years old.

...I said, time is absolute. For example we have time zones; actually, it's the same time everywhere on Earth. It's the same time everywhere in the universe.

...I said, when we look at stars, we don't see the past.

...I said, the speed of light is not an indication of how time behaves. Gravity is not an indication of how time behaves. I asked, does light have a speed?
..."Science"/convention says the "speed of light in a vacuum" is constant. There is no vacuum. (Again, does light have a speed?)
...**If the speed of light (again, does light have a speed?) is not related to how time behaves, then how old is our physical universe, and universe? How old is the Earth?**

...Let's talk about the center of the universe.
...The universe might not have a center. It might.
...As an example, the Earth could be the center of the universe.

(3) Is anything else endless? (We discussed whether the infinite universe, or the physical universe, is endless above.) (Is anything only non-physical? Is anything only something else (meaning, not physical, nor non-physical)?...Are some/all things partially-physical, partially-non-physical, and/or partially something else?)

...Endless in time?

...Endless in some other way?

Science is mathematics. What is mathematics?
Science seeks to uncover truths.

We need to…no, first, we need a little math joke. I did not invent this.
Three statisticians go hunting together. After a while, they spot a solitary rabbit. The first statistician takes aim and overshoots. The second aims and undershoots. The third shouts out, "We got him!"

Infinity concerns the boundless, endless; something that has no end.
(We need to not overestimate, nor underestimate, the size of infinity; the same applies for the numbers on the number line.) (...Someone asks, how can infinity have a size? It doesn't have a size? I say, that's a thought. Is that thought correct? No.) (As stated, infinity is infinity, and it is always the same size. In fact it is a number.)

The story about how I broke the spacetime continuum

I finished writing my science book. Somewhere in the middle of the book, I broke the spacetime continuum! 🌞