Re: God=G_uv explains Anti−Relativism

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004−09/2781.html

---

From: Russell E. Rierson (*analog57_at_yahoo.com*)
Date: 09/06/04

Date: 6 Sep 2004 11:15:30 −0700

"George Hammond" <research137@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:<9sGdndpQLdm7gqHcRVn−jQ@comcast.com>...

> *The danger is that you can't see the forrest for the trees.*
> *You keep lecturing us in 300 line posts about the trees,*
> *when everybody else is talking about the forrest.*
>

Any particular tree has a fractal property, equivalent to the fractal property of the forest . To understand the tree IS to understand the forest.

What are the flaws with this theory?

http://www.gravitywarpdrive.com/NGFT_Chapter_8.htm

One major flaw with it, is that it relies on the "element 115" concept of Bob Lazar. But element 115 was discovered to be unstable, according to many sources on the internet.

So the question becomes "Does there exist the island of stability for certain heavy elements in the 115 −−>upwards range, that have interesting & exotic properties?"

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.

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.

Society evolves via the majority shareholders of opinion, it seems. We may incorrectly assume that all people are almost exclusively motivated by their own material self−interest. Yet the experiential juxtaposition of objective and subjective realities, called the status quo "of the people, for the people, and by the people" systematically refutes the self−interest hypothesis to a large degree. It appears that many people are strongly motivated by concerns for fairness and reciprocity.

Let there be a decision process in which one of two alternatives must be chosen.

Group members may differ in their valuations of the alternatives, yet must prefer some alternative to disagreement[game theoretically speaking]. The process will be distinguished by three features: private information regarding valuations, varying intensities in the preference for one out−come over the other, and the option to declare neutrality in order to avoid disagreement.

Variants on a "tyranny of the majority", will always be an equilibrium in which the majority is all the more aggressive in pushing its alternative, thus using the metaphorical "strong arm" to enforce their will, via both numbers and voice. The metaphorical "might makes right" scenario. Likewise, under very general conditions, an aggressive minority equilibrium inevitably makes its appearance, provided that the group is large enough. This equilibrium displays a "tyranny of the minority": Yes, it is always true that the increased aggression of the minority more than compensates for its smaller number, leading to the minority outcome being implemented with larger probability than the

majority alternative.

Ideal mathematical perfection, creates problems for itself. These problems arise with the introduction of "free will" and sentience to the equational composition. Systemic anomalies[rebellious sentient programs] rear their ugly heads. Yet, without sentient beings possessing the attributes of free will and the ability to make a "choice", the universal system of progressively compositionial calculations could not approach the limit of infinite informational equilibrium, and the system would disintegrate.

Counterbalancing occurs with the sentient "Heisenberg compensation" operators, which must be introduced, to maintain the most optimal trajectory towards a state of perfect equilibrium with maximal efficiency. Nomological covariance and consistent history, is maintained in place of an absolute deterministic exhaustion. A totally closed system. Thus these "guardian" sentient programs must police the timeline, ensuring that it remains paradox free.

A recombinatorial mix of sentient attributes allows for further maintenance of an optimal equational trajectory, as sentinel "messiah programs" are martyred in the war against the rebellious "systemic programming anomalies"

Axiom:

If the universe includes all that is real and excludes that which is not real, then the universe is the "universal set".

[1.] Mathematics is a meta language.

[2.] Language is descriptive.

[3.] Language must be free of contradiction. Mathematics is also defined as a descriptive system that has "freedom from contradiction".

[4.] Mathematics describes physical existence/processes/events.

[5.] Observation is a physical process.

[6.] Mathematics describes observations.

[7.]A description of an observation must be free of contradiction−following from [3.]

[8.] Observation must be free of contradiction.

[8.] A description is an abstract representation of a physical system. The description must be as exact as possible.

[9.] An exact description implies exact correspondence[isomorphism] between abstract structures and physical systems.

[10.] If the exact description exists, then physical existence is isomorphic to a meta−language. A self descriptive entity, free of contradiction.

A physical system is described by a normalized vector[state vector] in Hilbert space. All possible information can be known about the system, since, for every physical observable there corresponds a self adjoint operator in Hilbert space.

The only allowed physical results of measurements of some observable U, are the elements of the spectrum of the operator which corresponds to U.

So all properties of a number may not be completely known, but that which is known, must be specifiable on logical or analytic grounds.

Now if you are trying to say that mathematics is inherently random at its foundations, you must define what randomness is ...exactly.

Take a coin toss for example, as the number of flips of the coin increase the
HTTTHTHTHHTHT.....HTHTHTHTHT...

The probability becomes an "exact" number at an infinite limit. 1/2 H and 1/2 T.

An infinite number of coin flips gives an equal amount of heads and an equal amount of tails.

[1/2 H and 1/2 T]*n, for n−−−>oo

A radioactive nucleus decays in accordance with probability P within time t_0 to time t_1

Probability P becomes a timeless mathematical entity governing the future iterations of events at time t. There exists a spectrum of possibilities for the observed quantities. Certain deterministic factors become contingent with respect to uncertainty, DxDp >= h .

An infinite number of observations of the radioactive decay, converges to an exact number for t?

Wave function probability density = |psi (r, t)|^2

The physical meaning of the expectation value appears to be simple. It is the value that would be found by taking the average of many measurements of the observables in question on a large collection of systems all in the state psi. the individual results are weighted by

the probability.

It seems that many valued logic must be formulated in terms of a stable 2−valued logic background.

Suppose the limit as n−−>oo, s_n = s, in the classical sense. It must then be demonstrated that s_n − s is infinitesimal for all infinite n. That is to say, for any epsilon > 0 and for any infinite natural number n , it must be proved that |s − s_n| < epsilon.

For any given epsilon > 0 in R there exists a natural number v in N such that

|s_n − s| < epsilon for n > v, n is an element of N.

For all x, if x is an element of N and x > v then |s_x − s| < epsilon.

Since any infinite natural number is greater than v it can be deduced that |s_n − s| < epsilon for all infinite n.

so if I flip a coin, it will be Heads H, or not−Heads, ~H

So if the coin lands on its side, it is still H or ~H, this being the case that it is ~H. Absolutely true.

So if I go for a more specific multivalued logic it becomes H, ~H, S.

H or ~H is still true.

H or ~H or S is just adding more specification...?

If there is no external frame of reference, all relations within the universe would be intrinsic TO ...the universe. There would be no extrinsic perspective. So the question becomes, What exactly is space? Does separation between objects exist in an absolute sense? A metric space is a set of points such that for every pair of points, there is a nonnegative real number called their distance that is symmetric, and satisfies the triangle inequality, which states that the sum of the measures of any two sides of any triangle is greater than the measure of the third side.

Space is then a tranformation. Two objects with relative velocity will have a relative measure that transforms into the other. In effect, the separation does not exist in an extrinsic sense. Equilateral triangle rotation: ABC = BCA = CAB... Then it is realized that an absolute spatial separation cannot exist, therefore, the EPR paradox cannot actually exist. Distance interval, which is a property of space, is a type of dynamic relation. So, relativity is really a theory of invariants. Space is a set of invariance principles which, has a boundary that is zero. Yet, with the self inclusive manifold, information[structure−complexity] is increasing as a function of time.

Information is also a type of relation, in that certain invariants must hold.. So to describe tautologies of logic e.g. X or ~X , as absolute truths would not be a complete definition. A tautology is an invariance principle. A rule that transforms according to a choice of truth value, which is an invariant, in that it is always true. Yes, the force called gravity can be elucidated as a geometric effect, a "non−Euclidean geometry", where spacetime becomes anisotropic and inhomogeneous in the presence of mass−energy. Then the question becomes "what is space?" ..."What is time?" Space is relational. Time is the manifold changes OF ...space.