The Philosophical and Mathematical Implications of Division by $\frac{0}{0} = 1$ in Light of Einstein's Theory of Special Relativity

Budee U Zaman

September 2023

Abstract

The enigma of dividing zero by zero $\frac{0}{0}$ has perplexed scholars across philosophy, mathematics, and physics, remaining devoid of a clear-cut solution. This lingering conundrum leaves us in an unsatisfactory position, as there emerges a genuine necessity for such divisions, particularly in scenarios involving tensor components that are both set at zero. This article endeavors to grapple with this profound issue by leveraging the insights of Einstein's theory of special relativity. Surprisingly, when we wholeheartedly embrace the ramifications of this theory, it becomes evident that zero divided by zero must equate to one $\frac{0}{0} = 1$. Essentially, we are confronted with a pivotal decision: either embrace the feasibility and definition of dividing zero by zero, in accordance with Einstein's theory of special relativity, or reevaluate the integrity of this fundamental theory itself. This exploration delves into the profound consequences arising from this critical choice.

1 Introduction

The concept of dividing zero by zero (0/0) has perplexed philosophers, mathematicians, and physicists for centuries. It remains a quandary that lacks a definitive solution, leaving us in a state of intellectual unrest. While it may seem paradoxical and even forbidden to divide zero by zero, there are compelling arguments suggesting the necessity of such an operation, particularly within the realm of physics, where the need arises to divide one tensor component equal to zero by another tensor component also equal to zero. This conundrum has persisted, defying philosophical, logical, mathematical, and physical resolution, challenging our understanding of the fundamental principles that govern the universe.

In this contribution, we embark on a journey to unravel the enigma of dividing zero by zero by exploring the profound implications of Albert Einstein's theory of special relativity. While the prospect of division by zero may seem heretical in the traditional sense, we will demonstrate that Einstein's revolutionary theory not only permits such an operation but, in its ultimate consequence, demands it. Thus, we find ourselves at a crossroads, where we must either embrace the division of zero by zero as a valid and defined mathematical operation or consider the possibility that Einstein's theory of special relativity faces refutation.

This exploration delves into the deep interplay between mathematical theory and physical reality. It forces us to question established conventions and ponder the implications of radical ideas. In the following pages, we will elucidate the arguments both for and against the division of zero by zero, ultimately arriving at a compelling conclusion that sheds light on the profound connection between mathematical abstractions and the fabric of the universe itself.

Our journey begins with an exploration of the historical and philosophical perspectives surrounding the enigma of 0/0, which has perplexed some of the greatest minds throughout history. We will then delve into the mathematical and logical intricacies of dividing zero by zero, highlighting the challenges it poses to our current understanding of mathematics. Subsequently, we will embark on an in-depth examination of Einstein's theory of special relativity, shedding light on its fundamental principles and how they relate to the division of zero by zero.

As we progress, we will encounter the pivotal moment when the theory of special relativity, with its profound implications for space and time, leads us to a seemingly paradoxical but logically consistent conclusion: $(0/0) = 1$. This assertion, rooted in the fabric of the universe as described by Einstein, challenges our preconceived notions and compels us to reconsider the boundaries of mathematical possibility.

2 Discussion on This Topic

Throughout the development of mathematical science, the issue of dividing zero by zero (0/0) has been a source of enduring contradictions and debates. In contemporary mathematics, this operation is categorized as an "indeterminate form," and it is commonly held that there is no well-defined value for 0/0. While various ancient civilizations such as the Babylonians, Greeks, and Mayas employed symbols akin to our modern zero, the predominant credit for the arithmetic of zero is often attributed to Hindu contributions, notably the work of Brahmagupta.

However, it's worth highlighting that Aristotle, a disciple of Plato, made substantial contributions to the concept of zero and the notion of division by zero. Aristotle explicitly asserted the impossibility of dividing by zero nearly fifteen centuries before Bhaskara's time. In his "Physics," Aristotle delved into the concept of zero and concluded that there exists no ratio of zero to any number. He did not regard zero as a number in the strictest sense and excluded division by zero based on conventional word meanings.

Nicomachus, influenced by Aristotle's teachings, acknowledged certain arithmetic operations involving zero. He posited that the sum of nothing added to nothing remains nothing ($0 + 0 = 0$). Nevertheless, it was not until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that zero gained wider acceptance in algebra.

Brahmagupta, an Indian mathematician and astronomer, is credited with one of the earliest references to division by zero in his work, the Brahmasphutasiddhanta. However, his work introduced algebraic inconsistencies, prompting subsequent scholars like Mahavira to attempt revisions.

In 1152, Bhaskara, more than five centuries after Brahmagupta, presented a division by zero, indicating a quotient of the fraction $3/0$. Importantly, Bhaskara did not assert that division by zero was impossible.

These mathematical concepts from Hindu scholars eventually disseminated to Arabic and Chinese mathematicians and later to Europe. The Chinese mathematician Qin Jiu-shao introduced the symbol "0" for zero in 1247, and notions related to infinity were developed by John Wallis in the seventeenth century. Wallis introduced the symbol ∞ to represent infinity and proposed that $1/0$ equals infinity.

Isaac Newton endorsed Wallis's stance, stating that $1/0$ is equal to infinity. George Berkeley critiqued infinitesimal calculus and questioned the mathematical significance of division by zero in his work, "The Analyst."

Augustin-Louis Cauchy played a pivotal role in providing a rigorous foundation for infinitesimal calculus by formalizing the concept of limits.

Despite the persistent efforts of numerous mathematicians throughout history, the division of zero by zero remains an unresolved concept in mathematics today. The question of whether Einstein's theory of special relativity might offer insights into this issue remains an open inquiry.[1] [2] [3] [6] [4] [7] [5]

2.1 Definitions,Experiments and Working

The widespread acceptance and significant influence of well-constructed thought experiments in scientific inquiry share several key attributes. Most notably, they offer the opportunity to explore fundamental aspects of nature even in situations where conducting a real experiment is either challenging or prohibitively expensive. Additionally, thought experiments can effectively expose contradictions within a theory, ultimately leading to the rejection of that theory. Furthermore, it's important to emphasize that thought experiments have the capacity to provide compelling evidence both in favor of and against a given scientific theory.

However, it is crucial to recognize that while thought experiments serve various purposes across a range of disciplines, they are not a substitute for real experiments. In essence, real experiments and thought experiments each have their unique roles and contributions. Together, they can aid us in addressing complex problems, such as the division of zero by zero.

The Einstein Equation , Mass and Energy Equivalence

Einstein's discovery of the equivalence of matter/mass and energy in the year 1905 lies at the core of today's modern physics. According to Albert Einstein , the rest-mass m_o, a measure of the inertia of a (quantum mechanical) object is related to the relativistic mass m_R by the equation

$$m_o = m_R \times \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$

Thus far and without loss of generality, the total energy of a physical system RE is numerically equal to the product of its matter/mass m_R and the speed of light c squared. We rearrange the equation above and do obtain

$$\frac{E_O}{E_R} = \frac{m_o \times c^2}{m_R \times c^2} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$

where m_o denotes the 'rest' mass, m_R denotes the 'relativistic' mass, v denotes the relative velocity and c denotes the speed of light in vacuum.

Unveiling the Insights of the Normalized Relativistic Energy-Momentum Relation

Before delving deeper into the intricate connection between Einstein's special relativity theory and the enigmatic issue of dividing zero by zero, let us first undertake the task of deriving the comprehensive expression for the normalized relativistic energy-momentum relation. This endeavor, while marginally more involved, will lay the foundation for a more thorough exploration of these intertwined concepts.

$$\frac{m_o}{m_R} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$

Squaring both sides and rearrange

$$\frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R} + \frac{v \times v}{c \times c} = 1$$

In the realm of special relativity theory, no experimental or theoretical evidence has emerged to suggest that the relativistic energy-momentum relationship falters under any specific circumstances. Thus, based on the aforementioned relationship, it can be inferred that

$$\frac{v \times v}{c \times c(1 - \frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R})} = 1$$

In 1905, Albert Einstein introduced his groundbreaking theory of special relativity, which marked a significant departure from Isaac Newton's centuries-old mechanics. One fundamental aspect of Einstein's theory is its assertion that the speed of light in a vacuum remains constant, regardless of the energy of the photons—a principle known as Lorentz invariance. Over the years, numerous observational and experimental investigations have scrutinized Einstein's theory of special relativity, providing ever-expanding opportunities to assess its validity.

What stands out is that Einstein's predictions regarding special relativity have consistently aligned with experimental data, even as technology advances and our ability to test the theory continues to grow. This enduring harmony between theory and observation underscores the remarkable resilience of Einstein's ideas and reinforces the enduring relevance of his groundbreaking work in the realm of physics.

2.2 Einstein's Relativistic Energy-Momentum Relation in the Limit of Rest Mass Approaching Zero

Due to Einstein's theory of special relativity the rest-mass 0m of a particle can be equal to zero. In this case the energy as such a particle is not destroyed but converts completely into the pure energy of a wave. Under conditions of special relativity (inertial frames of reference) there are circumstances, where the rest-mass (i.e. of a particle like photon) is $m_o = 0$ Under conditions where the rest-mass is $m_o = 0$ we must accept that

$$v \times v = c \times c$$

Proof In general, due to special relativity, it is

$$\frac{m_o}{m_R} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} ...(i)$$

$m_o = 0$ put in one
and we get

$$v \times v = c \times c$$

Theorem : Einstein's Relativistic Energy-Momentum Relation at Rest (v = 0)
Einstein's theory of special relativity remains applicable even in scenarios where the relative velocity (v) between objects is equal to zero. In such cases, the wave energy of a quantum mechanical object does not disappear; instead, it undergoes a complete conversion into pure particle energy. This means that even when objects are at rest relative to each other, the energy associated with the quantum mechanical wave nature of particles transforms entirely into the energy associated with the particle's mass and motion, as described by Einstein's famous equation,$E = mc^2$, where E is energy, m is mass, and c is the speed of light.
Now we will prove that
$m_o \times m_o = m_R \times m_R$

Proof
Let

$$\frac{m_o}{m_R} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}} ...(ii)$$

Squaring both sides and rearrange

$$\frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R} + \frac{v \times v}{c \times c} = 1$$

Let we take v=0
we get result

$$\frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R} = 1$$

so
$m_o \times m_o = m_R \times m_R$

2.3 Claim

Under the conditions of special relativity, which pertain to inertial frames of reference, the division of zero by zero is not only possible but also permitted. In particular, it is indeterminate under these circumstances. In other words, when dealing with relativistic physics, the expression zero divided by zero does not have a single well-defined numerical value; instead, it can have various potential outcomes depending on the specific mathematical and physical context, making it an indeterminate form.

$$\frac{0}{0} = 1$$

Proof

$$\frac{m_o}{m_R} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}}$$

squaring both sides

$$\frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R} = 1 - \frac{v^2}{c^2}$$

after this

$$1 - \frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R} = \frac{v^2}{c^2}$$

$$c^2 = \frac{v^2}{1 - \frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R}}$$

so

$$1 = \frac{v^2}{c^2(1 - \frac{m_o \times m_o}{m_R \times m_R})} ....(iii)$$

Based on the theorem discussed earlier, which pertains to situations where the relative velocity (v) is equal to zero, it can be concluded that the rest mass (m_0) is equivalent to the relativistic mass (m_R). Thus, in this specific scenario where objects are at rest relative to each other, we can substitute (m_R) with (m_0) and the outcome remains the same. In other words, the mass of the object is consistent and equal, whether you consider it in its rest frame (m_0) or in a relativistic context (m_R)with zero relative velocity.
put in (iii) v=o and $m_o = m_R$ we get result

$$\frac{0}{0} = 1$$

3 Certain Conclusions and Implications of the Discussion

The concept of indeterminate forms and the division of zero by zero has been a topic of debate and discussion in mathematics for many years. Various approaches and interpretations exist, and different mathematical contexts may yield different results. Let's explore this topic further.

Indeterminate Forms

Indeterminate forms are mathematical expressions that do not have a well-defined or straightforward value when evaluated directly. Some common examples include $0/0$, ∞/∞, $0 \times \infty$,$\infty - \infty$, $1/\infty$, and∞/o . These forms often appear in limit calculations.

Historical Perspective

Historically, division by zero (0/0) was considered undefined because it could lead to contradictory results and paradoxes. Aristotle's ideas on this topic were influential in shaping this perspective.

Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity

The passage suggests that the division of 0 by 0 is claimed to be determinate as $(0/0) = 1$ based on Einstein's special theory of relativity. This appears to be a novel interpretation of mathematical operations influenced by the principles of relativity, but it's essential to note that this view may not be widely accepted in the mathematical community.

L'Hospital's Rule

L'Hospital's Rule is a mathematical technique used to evaluate limits of indeterminate forms. It's named after Guillaume de l'Hôpital and provides a method for resolving certain types of indeterminate forms by taking derivatives. The passage questions the general validity of L'Hospital's Rule.

Continuing Debate

The passage highlights that there are differences in how mathematicians treat indeterminate forms, and the general validity of certain rules, like L'Hospital's Rule, is under scrutiny.

Paradoxes

The passage suggests that the division of zero by zero can lead to paradoxes if specific rules of precedence are not respected. These paradoxes can arise when dealing with indeterminate forms and highlight the challenges in assigning consistent values to such expressions.

In summary, the interpretation and treatment of indeterminate forms, particularly the division of zero by zero, remain topics of discussion and debate in mathematics. Different mathematical contexts and approaches may yield varying results, and ongoing research and exploration continue to shape our understanding of these concepts.

3.1 Some Examples

1 At first glance, the equation $1 = 2$ is clearly incorrect. However, when we multiply both sides of this equation by 0, we obtain $1 \times 0 = 2 \times 0$, which simplifies to $0 = 0$, a valid mathematical statement. Now, if we attempt to divide by zero, we have $(0/0) = (0/0)$. Based on the earlier assertion that $(0/0)$ equals 1, we arrive at the equation $1 = 1$, which is undeniably correct.

This sequence of operations seems to lead to a contradiction. Starting with an obviously false statement $(1 = 2)$, we end up with a true statement $(1 = 1)$. The source of this paradox lies in the multiplication by zero. It demonstrates that multiplying by zero can transform something incorrect into something correct. In essence, the multiplication by zero poses a more significant challenge than the division by zero.

Therefore, it appears that division by zero should be treated with greater caution and priority than multiplication by zero. When we recognize this fundamental aspect, our perspective on mathematical operations involving zero shifts.

2

Once again, let's revisit the assertion that $1 = 2$, which is fundamentally incorrect. When we multiply both sides of this equation by 0, we get $1 \times 0 = 2 \times 0$. Now, if we decide to divide by zero, we have $((1 \times 0)/0) = ((2 \times 0)/0)$.

Now, here's where things get interesting. If we prioritize the division by zero before the multiplication by zero, we end up with $(1 \times (0/0)) = (2 \times (0/0))$. Since it's been suggested that $0/0$ equals 1, this leads to the equation $1 = 2$, which paradoxically matches our incorrect starting point. In essence, this scenario underscores the notion that the division of zero by zero is not only conceivable but can also be defined. However, to navigate the potential paradoxes that arise when dividing zero by zero, it becomes imperative to establish precise rules of precedence for these operations. Surprisingly, multiplying by zero is shown to be just as intricate as dividing by zero in this context. Both operations demand careful consideration to avoid contradictions and paradoxes in mathematical reasoning.

3 Once again, let's address the assertion that $1 = 2$. Initially, we have the incorrect statement $1 = 2$. When we multiply both sides of this equation by 0, it becomes $1 \times 0 = 2 \times 0$. Subsequently, if we attempt to divide by zero, we have $((1 \times 0)/0) = ((2 \times 0)/0)$.

Now, let's manipulate this equation by rearranging it. By following the idea proposed by John Wallis in 1656, who stated that "$1/\infty$ ... should be regarded as zero," we can arrive at a different interpretation. So, under the circumstances where $(1/0 = \infty \textit{ and } 1 = 0 \times \infty \textit{ and } 0/0 = 1)$, we can express our equation as $((\infty) \times 0) = (2 \times (\infty) \times 0)$.

This new equation appears to lead us back to our original (incorrect) starting point: $1 = 2$. This result is equivalent to the initial assertion.

4 Conclusions

In conclusion, the longstanding mathematical conundrum of dividing zero by zero has found a resolution within the framework of special relativity, yielding the result $(0/0) = 1$. However, as this solution arises, it also gives rise to new challenges and questions. This development necessitates a reevaluation of the general applicability of mathematical tools like L'Hôpital's rule, which traditionally dealt with indeterminate forms involving zero.

Moreover, it becomes increasingly clear that careful consideration and a detailed examination of the rules of precedence are essential when performing algebraic operations with zero. The interplay between zero, infinity, and division by zero continues to provoke mathematical inquiry and requires a nuanced approach to ensure logical consistency within mathematical reasoning.

In the realm of mathematics, as in science and philosophy, resolving one question often leads to the emergence of new inquiries, emphasizing the ever-evolving nature of mathematical exploration and understanding

References

[1] Jan A Bergstra, Yoram Hirshfeld, and John V Tucker. Meadows and the equational specification of division. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(12-13):1261–1271, 2009.

[2] Carl B Boyer. An early reference to division by zero. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 50(8):487–491, 1943.

[3] Bibhutibhusan Datta. Early history of the arithmetic of zero and infinity in india. *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, 18:165–176, 1927.

[4] H Michiwaki, S Saitoh, and M Yamada. New meanings of the division by zero and and interpretations on 100/0= 0 and 0/0= 0. *International Journal of Applied Physics and Mathematics*, 6(1), 2016.

[5] Hiroshi Okumura and Saburou Saitoh. Applications of the division by zero calculus to wasan geometry. *GLOBAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH ON CLASSICAL AND MODERN GEOMETRIES"(GJARCMG)*, 7(2):44–49, 2018.

[6] HG Romig. Discussions: early history of division by zero. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 31(8):387–389, 1924.

[7] Saburo Saitoh, Hiroshi Michiwaki, and Masato Yamada. Reality of division by zero z/0= 0. *International Journal of Applied Physics and Mathematics*, 6(1):1–8, 2016.