

Re: a programm

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008–04/msg00640.html>

- *From:* xxein <xxein@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 7 Apr 2008 21:15:24 –0700 (PDT)
-

On Apr 7, 7:39 pm, "Thomas Heger" <hba...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

xxein:

You are missing a very basic point. You cannot map math to the physic and expect it to be anything congruent unless you can measure an activity and be able to distinguish whether the measurement was affected by the activity. Iow, recognising the difference between objective and subjective measurement.

TH

the basic idea is to precisely define the role of the observer. That is the important point. Observer stands for any kind of experiment, measurement and the space of our observation. That is governed by our fields, matter, observations, 3d space ..

On the other hand I have the same phenomana modelled in an imaginary complex space build out of quaternions. That is called the real space. Its real because its not observed. This is because we humans are important, but don't govern the laws of physics. If you want to understand the laws of physics you can't measure. You can only guess. But there are strong restrictions for guesses that come from measurements.

There is a corespondance between spacetime and space+time. The elements of spacetime are mapped into our observation–space according to some rules.

First rule: everything is related to an observer. That guy (simply anything could be an observer) is than the center of the universe.

Second: the signs of the metrics are swapped.

Third : various fields arise out of geometric relations in spacetime

Forth: everything get units and values (without an observer we couldn't define a second)

Objective measurement you can't have. You can measure something that is happening (in reality) but that is always subjective. You can't have anything else, because everybody is allways somewhere. You can only perform measurements based on your own definitions. To some abstract imaginary truth you dont have access. That doesn't mean, that reallity doesn't exist.

Thomas Heger

Re: a programm

xxein: Granted that we can't an objective measurement (my bad), but you can extract it. That is the essence of the physic.

The physic is the objective form of itself and how it reacts to itself. But simply choosing certain conditions and making a physics to the sum of its parts doesn't work. Unless you understand how the physic works with itself, you will remain understanding only the sum of its parts called physics.

To assume that some trick will allow us to completely understand is a false hope. What we can do, however, is change "how" we believe.

We don't have to believe anything. The universe will not stop if we don't believe a certain thing.

It is "what" we believe. This is our problem. The universe will adapt to anything we attempt to do with it. So? Explode a BH. It does not depend on anything we may use to describe it. It might create a separate universe that (to our subjective measurement if we were inside the event) would be the only universe to us.

So much for a lightcone. We really don't know, but we can speculate better than we have done so in the past. It really doesn't require rocket science (I have none) to gain an understanding of what is surrounding us. We just let belief stand in the way.

If we choose to believe "Harry Potter", that is what and how we believe. We will conform/contort a physics into that belief.

The issue becomes how a belief can possibly drive a physics into the brick wall of the physic and claim a dominance by simple belief or an abstract notion of a mathematic.

.

Re: a programm