

BITTERS

by

Joe Fisher

A computer can only “read” or “write” a binary coded insertion. A real toe is not made up of a binary code. All the letters in all of the world’s languages can be binary coded. No computer ever built could “tell” you if there is actually one real toe anywhere in the one real world. The computer can only relate how many times the binary coded letters that comprise the word toe in the correct sequential order are stored in its insides and/or on the Internet.

At 11:16 AM EST on March 28, 2013, I entered the word “toe” into the GOOGLE search engine. A drop down list immediately appeared for toefl; toe shoes, toes lyrics and toe fungus. After I hit the enter key, I was informed that there were about 368,000,000 results for the word toe and it had taken 32 seconds for the GOOGLE search engine to find every last one of them. On March 30, 2013, at 3:44 PM EST, I typed in the word “toe” into the GOOGLE Images Search Engine. A drop down list immediately appeared that read, toe, toes, toe nail fungus, toe shoes, toe nail designs, toe nail art, toe rings, toe fungus, toe socks, tofl, and toejam & earl. Most of the approximately 1,000 pictures displayed for the GOOGLE Images search were unquestionably of toes, but there were pictures of shoes and slippers and a couple of diagrams of tic-tac-toe arrangements and quite a few other depictions of objects or people that did not seem to have anything whatsoever to do with toes. Although there was no place on earth actually called Toe, there were 162 North Carolina businesses listed for toe in the GOOGLE MAPS Search. Of the ten business’s with toe in their names listed in the area where I live and whose locations were identified on the GOOGLE map of North Carolina by the letters A through J, two were for stores named Gold Toe and Tippy Toe and the others bore title such as The Head 2 Toe Boutique, Toe 2 Toe Dance Studio, and so on.

I entered the words “toe anatomy” into the GOOGLE Search Engine. A drop down list appeared that read toe anatomy, toe anatomy joint, toe anatomy bones, and toe anatomy names. After I depressed the Enter key, I was informed that about 4,800,000 results had been found in 19 seconds. The GOOGLE Images search brought forth about 1,000 skeletal diagrams of feet and the lower parts of legs, and some photographs of toes. There were a couple of pictures of dogs and cats. I have always thought that those animals had paws. There was a picture of Marlene Dietrich’s face. Apparently Ms. Dietrich had made a series of videos concerning the human anatomy one of which was titled “The Anatomy Of The Toe.” No place was named Toe Anatomy found by the GOOGLE Maps engine. Four North Carolina businesses were found. They did not have the words “toe” or “anatomy” in their names. They did have the word anatomy buried somewhere in their advertisement literature.

It is important to note that the information contained for all online searches changes every time one enters an inquiry. All real actions are unique. That is because GOOGLE is constantly updating all of its information garnered from all over the world. The number of results that GOOGLE announces for all of its searches is always expanding. Web sites which are the sources

for Internet search engines may cease to be operational, but all of their content remains searchable by all search engines they have ever been listed by at any time.

The fact is that had I truly wished to find out anything about a real toe, the only way I could have done so would have been by taking my shoes and socks off and by looking at one of my real toes. Real snowflakes are unique. Real toes are unique. I presently possess a set of real toes no other person who has ever lived, who is presently alive, or who will ever live anywhere in the future, had, has, or will ever come to possess.

I entered the word “logic” into the GOOGLE Search Engine. The drop down list read logic, logic puzzles logical fallacies, and logic pro. About 357,000,000 results were found in 27 seconds. Most of the thousand images detected in the GOOGLE Images Search were of logic puzzles or the covers of books dealing with logic. There was a picture of the guitar player Jimmy Hendrix apparently because it was being used by the logicnetwork.com. No place called Logic exists as far as the GOOGLE Maps Search engine could determine, but 215 North Carolina businesses practice some sort of commerce concerning logic.

The Universe is not all that difficult to understand. If you are familiar with the Rock, Paper Scissors hand gesture selection game, you have already acquired all of the information you will ever need in order to understand how the Universe actually operates. Fundamentally, the Universe consists of three inseparable aspects of a single real element. Light, matter and space are aspects of human singular apprehensible reality. Although the scientists have done their level best to try to isolate each of the three real aspects of reality by assigning abstract values and capricious abstract laws to each of them, immodestly telling all who will listen how matter behaves, especially as it pertains to the motion of matter through space, or how abstractly curved abstract space can become, or how easy it is to abstractly measure the abstract alacrity of a fabricated light through a fabricated vacuum tube, the scientists have only succeeded in complicating the easiest of natural human comprehension to make, and made it naturally chaotically unobtainable.

The real Universe only deals in absolutes. All information is abstract and all and every abstract part of information is excruciatingly difficult to understand. Information is always selective, subjective and sequential. Reality is not and cannot ever be selective subjective and sequential.

One (1) real Universe can only be eternally occurring in one real here and now while perpetually traveling at one real “speed” of light through one real infinite dimension once. One is the absolute of everything. (1) is the absolute of number. Real is the absolute of being. Eternal is the absolute of duration. Occurring is the absolute of action. Here and now are absolutes of location and time. Perpetual is the absolute of ever. Traveling is the absolute of conveyance method. Light is the absolute of speed. Infinite dimension is the absolute of distance and once is the absolute of history.

It seems to have escaped everyone’s attention that the Universe and everything real and imagined in it is unique, once The 2005 investigation of snowflake composition conducted by Ken-Ichi Maruyama and Yasushi Fujiyoshi¹ found, as every other scientific snowflake study had found, that despite a numbing amount of similarity, no two snowflakes of the trillions that have fallen to

¹ Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences 2005, Vol. 62 p1529-1544

earth, have ever been found to have been identical in separable molecular number or in individual snowflake size and designed arrangement. Each snowflake is perceptively unique. The reason for this uniqueness is probably because each snowflake had to be formed in a different place under slightly differing atmospheric conditions than every other snowflake has been formed. Obviously, although there has to be a first and a naturally formed irregular sequential accumulating last snowflake to fall in any snowfall, there are too many variables to determine any logical sequence for any grouping of falling snowflakes. There seems to be no way to determine which might be the largest, or the smallest, or the oldest, or the youngest of them even if a rough estimated average mean of the flakes' sizes and densities might be propounded for any particular snowfall. The fact that every subsequent snowfall will consist of differently formed snowflakes makes any speculative established mean meaningless.

Information is not reality. Information has nothing to do with reality. Reality is an absolute. It is the ultimate condition. It is the only real condition. One cannot acquire any more of reality than one has already gotten. The more information one collects, the less one will ever know about reality.

The astronomers produce reams of information about the stars without bothering to tell anybody that each star, like each snowflake is unique. Each star is composed differently than every other star can be and each star moves at a different distance from every other star that does. Each observation through a telescope is unique. As is each observation by a child through a kaleidoscope. Astronomical information is about as useful for understanding the Universe as baseball statistics are for deducing which team will win the World Series. Gathering statistics on unique events is utterly futile.

Albert Einstein may have been correct once when he theorized that $e = mc^2$, except he forgot to mention exactly how many times the equation would be accurate. Like all renowned scientists, Albert took it for granted that his equation would be accurate more than once. Well the real Universe does not allow anything real or imagined to occur more than once. While perfect abstract energy might abstractly be equal to perfect abstract amounts of abstract mass times perfect amounts of abstract light perfectly squared, innumerable times, real energy always consists of differing integrated amounts of real heat, real light, and real material motion, once.

Mathematicians totally ignore the reality of once. Mathematicians persist in using the same numbers and the same functions and values over and over again, and they fail to appreciate just how illogical their methodology is. Unique reality is not a contrived result of an identical repeatable calculation, nor is it any sort of speculative scientific conundrum.

According to various sites dedicated to mathematics on the Internet, the Arabic influenced occidental numbers are equally distanced apart abstract set points on an abstract straight line. Any of the abstract set points on the abstract straight line can be considered to be 0, as long as all of the subsequent ensuing equally distanced set points on the abstract straight line leading away from the 0 in one direction on the line are systematically numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, on up to infinity, and are understood to be -1, -2, -3, -4, -5, -6, -7, -8, -9, down to infinity leading away from the 0 along the opposite side of the abstract straight line.

We have no idea how counting started and we know even less about why it has persisted. We do not know how thinking started. That would entail our having to think how thinking started long after we had convinced ourselves that we had mastered the ability to think.

In a March 30, 2011 National Geographic News article written by Ker Than reproduced at the <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2011/03/110330-oldest-writing-europe-tablet-greece-science-mycenae-greek/> website, notes that a clay tablet found in the Greek village of Iklaina is the oldest known European object showing the use of numbers. The tablet was thought to have been created by a Greek Mycenaean scribe sometime between 1450 and 1350 BC. Civilizations have been traced by the archaeologists that existed long before 1350 BC, but unfortunately so far no visible trace of the numeric system they must have constantly used has survived.

During the time when mankind had to actually make their own numbers by chipping them out of a stone, or writing them down on a piece of paper, arithmetic was an efficient manageable useful method for keeping track of real things. Great care had to be taken in the way that the numbers were represented and even greater care was required by any subsequent users of those numbers. Then the mechanical number producing machine was invented. Presently, when displayed on some sort of flat surface, all numbers are difficult to distinguish. They usually are listed running vertically from top to bottom as progressing from lesser value to greater value. This remorseless lesser to greater numeric order rule also applies when the numbers are listed horizontally from left to right.

Modern users of arithmetic only repeatedly use the same abstract valued numbers. The problem is that when the numbers are depicted symbolically, they are shown illogically as being of the same height and width, of the same intensity of color and they are always set at the same distance apart. The function symbols used for the adding, subtracting, multiplying, and the dividing of numbers do not alter the appearance of the numbers. Numbers used in fractions are separated by a straight line and are usually of a smaller size. Decimal numbers are separated only by a decimal point. As there is only one absolute real thing once and that is the Universe, and as the Universe only produces one real detectable manifestation of anything real or imagined once, all numeric systems are utterly useless and needlessly contemplatively wasteful of any sensible person's time. There are no real numbers of things there is only one real or imagined thing at one time, once. One cannot use multiplicities of sameness to explain the unique.

While presenting numbers in the following distinctive fashion:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 20 30 40 50

$$2 + 4 = 6; \quad 7 - 3 = 4; \quad 4 \times 5 = 20; \quad 30 \div 10 = 3$$

would certainly at least improve the logic of their use considerably once since each number is logically of a different magnitude consistent with its presumed value, and of a different shade consistent with its presumed importance, and each number is differently distanced apart from each other number, it would do little to make them at all conform to the uniqueness of reality if they were to be continually used repeatedly.

Basically, all real situations can be individually covered by the assignment of alternating -1, 0 and 1 numeric values. Once you believe a thing exists, you can temporarily assign your thing a 1. You can then temporarily assign the milieu your thing exists in a 0, and you can conclude that the unseen energy that causes your thing to exist as it seems to be doing at the moment you catch sight of your thing could be logically temporarily assigned the value of -1 for no better reason than the pragmatic one of you not having the ability to see energy. Once you have established these reasonable parameters, you can fool around to your heart's content by temporarily assigning a hard thing a -1 then temporarily assigning the force that apparently keeps the thing hard a 1. You need not spend the rest of the day wondering if a hard thing could ever really exist in a 0 environment. All of the elements are fully integrated and constantly in motion.

Do not be deterred by the fact that no matter in which direction you happen to look, it is impossible to isolate a single thing. Ignore the fact that there appears to be trillions of stars up there in the night sky and billions of people all over the globe and thousands of this and millions of that. The 1, 0 and -1 basic formula applies to the Universe. However, as the snowflake studies and the DNA and fingerprints studies have shown, there is only one of anything real or imagined once. The formula is for everyday use. You can temporarily assign the number 0 to yourself. You can then temporarily assign the force that is keeping you in place looking like you do a -1. That means you are pleasantly in a positive place because a 1 is the only number you can temporarily assign to the situation you adroitly happen to be in.

Reality is always observable, objective and obvious, once. Information is always subjective, sequential and always ever growing substantially countless times.

Each observation from a telescope is unique, no matter how meticulously repeatedly recorded the information about the observation is kept. To suggest for one moment that the Universe is expanding is silliness. The Universe can only deal in absolutes. Expanding is not an absolute. Expanding is a humanly contrived subjective imaginative assertion. The only thing that really seems to be expanding is the amount of abstract information about every humanly known thing including all abstract matters concerning the Universe.

The greatest ignorers of the reality of once were Isaac Newton and Albert Einstein. Newton was convinced the observer could not be moving while repeatedly observing objects in motion and at rest. Albert Einstein was convinced that the observer moved relative to the motion of the objects repeatedly observed. They both seemed to have taken it for granted that each observer's observation would be the same if taken from the same place, and significantly such observations ought to be repeatable. They of course used examples of abstract observers observing abstract objects that were supposedly abstractly at rest and/or in abstract motion.

I am convinced that one real Universe can only be doing one real thing at one real “speed” once, which means that every real observer must constantly move at the same speed as the unique observed real objects did, otherwise the unique observed real objects could not be seen. Therefore, the default “speed” for everything in the Universe must be the “speed” of light. I am certain that light must be the only stationary substance in the Universe.

Despite an overwhelming amount of information about what light is made of and its supposed approximately 186,000 mps velocity through a vacuum tube, physicists remain uncertain as to whether light consists of identical waves or identical particles. Physicists allow that fabricated electromagnetic light waves moving at a lesser “speed” than the presumed “speed” of light can still be detected even though they are invisible. Fabricated invisible energy particles also moving at a lesser “speed” than the presumed “speed” of light can also be detected moving in the cyclotron. One has no need for instrumentation in order to detect real light.

While it is true that an initial burst of light from a fabricated flashlight must take a nanosecond to reach a surface upon the flashlight’s activation, once the beam hits a surface it stays in place. Light cannot move through light. That is why one cannot see the stars during the day. I think the flashlight’s beam stays stationary and its energy increases and starts retreating back to its source. The filament in the bulb always shines brighter than the emanation while the flashlight is on.

Let us suppose for one ridiculous moment that I am correct. An eternal real Universe has always produced the correct amount of real light to sustain itself eternally. If the light was stationary, that would mean that objects could never become stationary, because, just as identical snowflakes could never become a reality, so too, no identical physical states could ever come into existence. That would leave real matter and real space as being the only candidates for having the real ability to execute perpetual motion. Real light can infiltrate real space once, but light cannot penetrate matter or light. That would seem to indicate that matter could only move through light once and by doing so, have its motion uniquely regulated by its internal and external space, once.

The fabricated transmitted light inside of a television set must be stationary in order for the images to be electronically manipulated so that they appear to be moving. The fabricated light inside of the oscilloscope must be stationary in order for the wave patterns to be seen to be in motion. The fabricated illumination inside of the spectrograph must be stationary in order to indicate red or blue shift impetus. What if the light from a real star was actually stationary? One would only ever see a red shift on the spectrograph. Any light from a far distant galaxy might show a hint of a blue tint, however, if that galaxy got nearer, it would automatically show a red shift the moment its light reached earth and became stationary.

Reality is.

Information is not real. All information is abstract codswallop. All abstract information has to be sequenced. That means that all information has to have a starting point. As we have seen, mathematics starts with the abstract 0 point on the abstract straight line and continues positively and negatively in an identical fashion up to and down from abstract infinity. But there is only one real Universe once and there is only one real or imagined event once. Mindlessly building

seemingly identical number manipulating machines has led to the absurdity of my not knowing quite how to respond to the fact that American computer experts have seemingly contrived to produce about a million more sources of information for a toe than it has for logic. It seems to be somewhat illogical to me. Then again, I do have some familiarity with a real toe, albeit one of my own real toes. I have never really been interested in logic.

© Copyright April 2013 by Joseph W. Fisher