

Re: God=G_uv explains Anti-Relativism

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-09/1789.html>

From: sam ende (sam_at_sende.co.uk)

Date: 09/06/04

Date: Mon, 06 Sep 2004 23:43:16 +0100

Russell E. Rierson wrote:

- > 1. A phenomenon is considered to be "random", if individual outcomes
- > are uncertain but there is nonetheless a regular distribution of
- > outcomes in a large number of repetitions.
- >
- > 2. Apparent lack of purpose or cause.
- >
- >
- > The word random is used to express apparent lack of purpose or cause ;
- > an effect generated without an initiating cause/reason, is
- > logically absurd, thus true randomness cannot exist from a logical
- > perspective.

yes, i don't believe it does, as in i agree.

- >
- > On the other hand large numbers of ostensibly "random" events, are
- > constrained by probability distributions. Symmetry forms the basis
- > of truth.
- >
- >
- > 1. With a little earnest thought, one realizes that the concept of
- > randomness[acausality] is logically absurd.
- >
- > 2. The laws of physics are time independent. They hold for all frames
- > of reference.
- >
- > 3. Also, even if ...physical randomness is true, physical randomness
- > would not exist without time, or "change" – from one state to the
- > next.
- >
- > 4. If the physical laws are time independent then the physical laws,
- > by definition, did not arise "randomly".
- >
- > 5. The laws of physics are a set of organizing principles.
- >
- > 6. The only true example we have of an organizing principle is that of

> a "MIND"

>

> 7. *The universe came from a MIND.*

why ? i don't think so. i think it is like the distinction we make of mind and brain and finding no answer, maybe it is because it is superfluous, the distinction. i think we should be looking at chaos theory more.

sammi