

## Re: "Faster, More Powerful . 64 Bits!"

**Source:** <http://coding.derkeiler.com/Archive/Delphi/borland.public.delphi.non-technical/2004-03/3450.html>

---

**From:** Harry Van Tassell (*hairy\_at\_nada.com*)

**Date:** 03/15/04

Date: Mon, 15 Mar 2004 09:33:48 -0500

Eric Grange wrote:

- > *And to think that in a day not so far ahead users may complain*
- > *they need to buy an extra 128 petabyte memory stick to run the*
- > *latest psycho-visual user interface...*

Yeah, I hear you but what with it being a dull Monday morning I seem to remember that people like to attach some significant physical fact to a number so I Googled to get an estimate of how many stars are in the sky and found this estimate, "...concluded that about 70 thousand million million stars ( $7 \times 10^{22}$ ) shine down on us". That number seems big but I remember the old classic how many grains of sand would it take to fill the earth and remembered a number like  $10^{61}$ . Some more Googling turned up this:

[http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/archimedes/lrk\\_sand.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/archimedes/lrk_sand.html)

"In today's notation, Archimedes' estimate for the number of grains of sand that it would take to fill the then-known universe was  $1 \times 10^{63}$  grains of sand!"

But come to think of it that very difference between the numbers  $10^{61}$  and  $10^{63}$  was once used by a smart guy to impress upon me that it was a hellva big difference. He and I decided to investigate a smaller number that most people could relate to and, being zany chemical engineers, decided to estimate the number of gallons of urine produced daily by the population of Puerto Rico. We got an answer but for the life of me I can't seem to remember the number. ;-)

—Hairy