

Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2006-01/msg00884.html>

- *From:* "jonathan" <Write@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 29 Jan 2006 05:24:54 -0500
-

"don findlay" <don@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:1138489578.711474.136150@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

>

> jonathan wrote:

>

>> Reality and truth are found in the middle, where neither method
>> dominates, where certainty is minimized, in complexity

>>

>> The minute you hear a 'thinker' talk about a grand unified theory
>> or God, your first reaction should besimpletons.

>

> 'SRight. Answers arrived at by thinking are rarely any good. 'Logic'
> doesn't much serve us very well in the end. Too hubristic. Go with
> the gut.

Well what I meant was that classical science and religion are both trying to do the same thing. Trying to focus on some ultimate simplicity either some equation or singularity. Or one all knowing God. They are moving towards opposite extremes in simplicity. But the answers for both camps are actually found in complexity. Where the two meet. But their instinctive drive to reduce forces them ever farther apart, when they should be moving towards each other.

The most complex method would be when you can't really tell if it's science, religion, philosophy or politics. As they've all been merged. Now telling the difference is extremely easy since they're so all far apart. So disciplined for simplicity's sake.

In attractor theory this situation would be called being stuck in a static attractor. Like a ball bearing being spun inside a bowl. It eventually will end up at rest at the bottom, stuck there and unable to get out. Up against some brick wall forever.

The only way to get out of this static situation is to change frames of reference, from a search for simplicity to complexity.

Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...

>From reduction to holism. From objective to subjective.

All the camps would begin moving towards each other and a single unified method of understanding would emerge. By exalting and defining the most complex the universe has to offer, instead of searching for it's most simple and common 'element'.

This means our fundamental laws must be derived from life, the most complex the universe has to offer. Darwin should be our starting point, not particle physics etc. etc.

We let life define the physical universe, not the other way around as has been the assumption.

>

> It's an interesting point though, about science, religion and politics,
> the three main elements that hold top-down society together, and where
> they stand in relation to their practitioners, and except for politics,
> why there is such a schism between the practice and the practitioners.

I don't see any fundamental difference. Liberal and conservative... practicality and morality...science and religion. The two opposite extreme camps. A good politician seeks bipartisanship. A good philosopher is versed in science and religion.

A good politician appeals to both sides.

Politics stands above both science and religion just as philosophy does. By merging the two extremes. So now power flows from being part of each camp while not being stuck within any of them. By being difficult to define in terms of any of the camps.

Power flows from optimizing uncertainty.

Terrorists do this by their random attacks. Politicians do this by usurping the opposition's ideas. Or by simply being a vocal moderate. John McCain for example, or Arlen Specter. They have one foot in the othe side, while criticizing their own side. They give some things for everyone to like, and some things for everyone to dispise. This produces the max dynamic effect and appeal at the same time. Power!

> Is it necessary that it should be there, ..a reminder that individuals
> hold the reins? But doesn't that make for societal insecurity? Or is

Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...

Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...

> it the very ballast of lies and self-interest that serves us best?

It's our instinct to look for simplicity. For constants. But politicians appear as chameleons in their drive to merge the extremes and appeal to as many as possible.

> Seems to be so. Well, it seems to serve us, but whether 'best' is
> arguable. Those with the biggest 'spreading stain' seem to be the most
> successful. Singapore did all right though, under Mr Lee, .. though
> so many yet protest at the draconian whip. Should individuals be
> allowed their rampant run? Somebody was telling me yesterday that a
> prestigious boys school in Scotland now has police in the school to
> control them. At least, ..we hope that's what the police are
> doing....

So the question becomes how do we return power to the people?
Or restore the proper balance between the govt and people.

Politicians gain power by broadening their appeal, while dividing us into little compartments, interest groups, constituencies. By restoring the connectivity between people we reverse the flow of power. The internet is doing just that as we speak.

A free and open internet is everything for our future.

As the connections allow consensus to form and the people to speak as one. The people will define the politicians instead of the other way 'round. Freedom is always the correct answer.

But science and religion have become slaves to their own chosen frames of references. Only a fundamental change will allow them to escape the grip of their static attractors. This fundamental change must be in removing the distinctions between the two.

Having one foot in the door of the other side, while criticizing your own discipline. Think of all the 'greats' over time, people that truly changed the world for the better. In these terms what did Galileo do? Gandhi or Martin Luther King?

Or this guy, there's nothing more powerful when opposite extremes become one, when uncertainty is optimized.
<http://www.time.com/time/time100/leaders/profile/rebel.html>

Power is measured by effect.

Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...

>

.

• **References:**

- ◆ ***If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - ◇ *From:* Jo Schaper
 - ◆ ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - ◇ *From:* jonathan
 - ◆ ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - ◇ *From:* don findlay
 - ◆ ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - ◇ *From:* jonathan
 - ◆ ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - ◇ *From:* don findlay
- Prev by Date: ***Two Top Papers Ask: Is the World on a Path to Doom--With an Assist from the White House?***
 - Next by Date: ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - Previous by thread: ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - Next by thread: ***Re: If you are ever in Arkansas...***
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***