

## Re: Cold Fusion

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2004-07/6688.html>

---

**From:** Tom Potter (*tdp\_at\_earthlink.net*)

**Date:** 07/26/04

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 2004 17:21:56 +0800

"Prai Jei" <pystownsend@zyx-abc.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message  
news:ce0tt3\$2f6\$1@news6.svr.pol.co.uk...  
> *Tom Potter (or somebody else of the same name) wrote thusly in message*  
> <2mh10hFmqubbU8@uni-berlin.de>:  
>  
>> *[Snip all except Nos. 1 and 2 from each list]*  
>> *Imagine a hierarchy of objects as follows:*  
>> *1. Null*  
>> *2. Particle*  
>>  
>> *And next imagine a field associated with each*  
>> *object hierarchy has an intensity that is a function of the*  
>> *number of the contiguous objects in that class.*  
>> *1. F(0) - Null ( Space field "1" )*  
>> *2. F(1) - Particle ( Weak force field )*  
>>  
>> *And next imagine that other objects*  
>> *of the same class are affected by this field,*  
>> *and have a physical property "P(N)".*  
>> *1. P(0) - Null ( Distance "Space^0 and space^5" )*  
>> *2. P(1) - Particle ( Unnamed weak force property )*  
>>  
>  
> *How certain are you that your No. 2's are the immediate next level above*  
> *your No. 1's?*  
>  
> *It's one of my pet hypotheses that between Null (whatever you conceive*  
that  
> *to be) and any named concrete level, there is an infinite hierarchy of*  
> *levels in between.*  
> --  
> *Paul Townsend*

I tend to agree with you.

There is probably "an infinite hierarchy of levels in between"  
the object classes, and the number of levels

is limited by man's perception,  
and his need to limit the number of  
object classes to some workable number.

Current theory (Dirac)  
allows for a jump between null and fermions,  
and more precisely the electron.

There is enough information floating around to  
describe several other "fields"  $F(N)$   
along with the field's associated "property"  $P(N)$ .  
(For complex molecules, planetary systems, galaxies, etc.)

And no doubt, the intensions  
of all sets of objects are nebulous things,  
that are constantly shifting.

For example, man's definition of the set mankind,  
is subject to drift.

This drift would, in affect,  
fill in between any two set definitions  
fixed at some point in time and space,  
and tend to smear object sets into a continuum.

What also validates your position  
is the fact that certain bipolar properties  
are minimized in each object class  
( For example charge in atoms, and magnetic moment in nuclei.)  
and this suggests that even the most fundamental objects  
that we can perceive arise in bipolar pairs,  
as Dirac indicated.

It may be that man only "resonates" in certain states,  
and can only perceive the object classes  
that he is "tunable" to.

It is easy to imagine a population of objects becoming extinct,  
or an object combining with an "anti-object"  
and converted into pure space, but  
it is hard to imagine how a population of objects  
arises from nothing.

In any case, I suggest that a space dimension  
is required to precisely define each field/property pair,  
and that every object class  
( Including Republicans and Democrats )  
can be defined in terms of an appropriate set  
of  $N$  spaces, fields, and minimized properties,  
using the equations I mentioned in my post.

It is interesting to note,  
that even if the "field" associated with a complex object class,  
such as political preference, is approximated,  
and the number "N" which indicates the number of spaces  
needed to isolate the object class is estimated,  
the corresponding minimizing property is indicated,  
and a "Property Chart" can be formed,  
onto which various intensions of the object class  
can be entered.

For those who wish to pursue this,  
if you assume "N" space are adequate to define some object set,  
this means that you need "N" fields and "N" minimizing properties.

As I mentioned in my original post,  
the minimizing fields are functions of the  
"diffusity" of field(N).

You can traverse the minimizing properties  
from space(N) to field(N) (Or vice versa),  
knowing that the properties "diffuse" from greater to lesser,  
and speculate on what to call the various minimizing fields.

After you think you have identified the minimizing fields,  
you know what causes the field,  
and you can start to fill in the blank places  
on your property chart, with common names.

--

Tom Potter      <http://home.earthlink.net/~tdp>