

## Re: intrinsic energy

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-07/msg00924.html>

---

- *From:* malibu <vegan16@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sat, 14 Jul 2007 20:48:34 -0700
- 

On Jul 14, 9:37 pm, Sam Wormley <sworml...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

malibu wrote:

On Jul 14, 8:55 pm, Sam Wormley <sworml...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

I don't understand your frustration, John. The world is not Newtonian. Oh, most of what we experience is certainly well described by Newton, Maxwell and the like... but we have copious evidence for far stranger phenomena that require fruitful theories like relativity and the quantum electrodynamics to explain. It's a wonderful and fascinating world, John!

Hey, did you see that photon fly by, John? Good! Neither did I. If one of us had seen it... it wouldn't exist anymore!

Cheers,  
-Sam

I don't understand why you prefer to not understand, Sam.

Keep asking 'why' until you get a proper answer, Sam. Don't be satisfied with the pap that you spout.

Re: intrinsic energy

It is not and never will be an answer to say "because the world is strange."

Our effort with our Science is to make thing \*not strange\*.

It's called \*understanding\*, Sam, and it cannot be accomplished by teaching people that it cannot be accomplished. That is Anti-Science, Sam. Its name is QM.

John

QM explains many things, John. QM has contributed, necessarily, to our modern society with GPS, Cell Phones and CD players.

I'm not saying it isn't a tool.  
It's just a very clumsy tool that is preventing the development of better tools.

Doesn't matter what your theory—  
if you pour enough money in, you're bound to stumble into something sooner or later. MANY of our more important discoveries are purely serendipitous—hindsight is 20/20 no matter what your theory.  
The foresight of QM isn't 20/20 by a longshot.  
It's certainly not good enough for me— truthfully, Sam is it good enough for you? Is it the final understanding? I hope not.

John

.