

A Philosophical Physicist, Statement No. 2

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-08/msg01190.html>

- *From:* "Douglas Eagleson" <eaglesondouglas@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 7 Aug 2005 16:56:09 -0700
-

A Philosophical Physicist, Statement No. 2
Douglas eagleson, 2005

(Aristotle's works must be printed in simple terms.)

In my last USENET posting a school of philosophical physics was defined.

And when Penrose was trying to communicate the school in relation to Plato's world of abstract observation he had a single failure.

He could not either communicate as a teacher the form of Plato or abstract the form in modern English.

I have written numerous examples of the abstract form and its application.

And in this statement I seek to simply clarify the form.

A word called the form was utilized by Aristotle. And it was discussed ad-nausium.

AND it was not given the correct translation to the word inference.

A form is an inference.

It is a pattern of consistent thought such that the outcome appears a conclusion.

People walk this earth with many varied inference instillments.

And the common English instillment is a predicate. A form of simple symbol remembrance.

And to have the teacher discuss a classroom topic without warning of the exact inference utilized is a common occurrence.

Instilled thinking is common.

And a form as the word to convey a correct thinking as opposed to an arbitrary thinking is a good translation.

Making the forms, as opposed to the form, the kind of diligence in readership required of Aristotle.

B. Russell read and studied Aristotle as a modern philosopher. He read the first book of Aristotle and concluded that Aristotle was incorrect.

He was guilty of reading incorrectly.

Another teacher might have convinced him of his error. But as a real philosopher he was left with only his own pondering.

Russell's Paradox is solved.

His relation of inference was a warning of by Aristotle. Aristotle had an example of the kind of dilemma Russell's inference would encounter.

A set of any thing as opposed to the set of the abstract thing was his error.

Russell's inference was a single error.

A set of the abstract exists in relation to only the set itself.

Russell abstract inately, but could not cause the generalized abstraction to exist. He needed a teacher.

And to take on the task of redefining a school was B. Russell's's.

Search the earth as a philosopher and many teacher will be found to teach

Plato's form. By accident.

A task of mine is to ensure the school is never lost to translation again.

An English translation of Aristotle's work is surely grammatically transformed.

And the dislocation I speak of is clearly visible in the modern works, in English.

And here is a single sentence in English in Plato's form, in example.

"An air"

A noun is stated and it is assumed to be the abstract air. But in reality it is the sentence, "For air."

A modifier called the adjective is used to determine the kind of air.

A two word sentence in Plato's form sets the context for the whole paragraph. Aristotle used the first word sometimes to make the context.

"For air."

The sentence preceding states, that in relation to all previous discussion on the theory of air, the following statement is true.

And to mistake that is to never, ever be able to read the works of Aristotle.

A misreading is a failed read if the work is surely in a form distinct.

And to read a translation and assume the translator able to make the form's necessary context is a failed philosopher.

A need to translate the works of foreign writer's personally

is a common knowledge.

Russell surely never translated.

And so here is a single error given
to english.

A new word is necessary to convey the
size of the error. An adjective
in relation to the original word
is a sorry example of 2000 years of mystery.

"A modifier of the symbol can be
used to alter its meaning."

A verb is defined where the abstract
modifier redefines.

And the word is a "countenance".

A word countenance is the correct
meaning in relation to the writer's
intention and not the assumed.

So, in relation to English all the
works of Aristotle have a grammatical
structure call countenance present.

And so to be able to translate
the modifier assigned must be correct.

And in reality a translation without benefit
of the modifier suits a reader well.

Leave it to the reader.

Let the reader determine the meaning
of the symbol.

And so the sophisticated translation
as opposed to the simple translation
is warned.

An entire school was destroyed by
sophisticated translation.

Who prints the simple works of
Aristotle?

A society of the printer has need to
violate the rule of the editor

a single time.

And the works of Aristotle must be printed simply.

note: Aristotle was a kind of writer who was prolific. And his error capacity was zero. So, the necessity to simply print his works is life threatening necessity.

2000 years of confusion. Simple printing in English is mandatory.

• *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ ***Re: A Philosophical Physicist, Statement No. 2***
 ◇ *From:* Robert Kolker
- ◆ ***Re: A Philosophical Physicist, Statement No. 2***
 ◇ *From:* Uncle Al

- Prev by Date: ***Re: Feynman Double slit experiment and others***
- Next by Date: ***Re: A Philosophical Physicist, Statement No. 2***
- Previous by thread: ***A Philosophical Physicist's Statement***
- Next by thread: ***Re: A Philosophical Physicist, Statement No. 2***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***