

Re: Quantum Gravity 216.1: Intermission: Trolls/Graffiti Artists Attempt to Increase Their Credibility

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-12/msg01071.html>

- *From:* OsherD <mdoctorow@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 20 Dec 2007 22:25:54 -0800 (PST)
-

On Dec 20, 10:06 am, "rolf183" <nos...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Actually, just draw a curve a relationship between time and acceleration, then match your simple equations to specific portions of the curve. $\exp(x)$ (and the rest of your functions, etc) is arguably a very poor one, (too simple) to model this relationship. By "simple" I mean, it only has one degree of freedom, not enough degrees of freedom to allow close fitting of the curve. But if you specified a specific region of time, then you could apply your modeling to it with small error.

[My (Osher's) Reply below:]

Rolf183, I give an example of closer fitting of the Generalized Exponential Function (GEF for short) in the Schrodinger Potential Step in my newest posting of just a few minutes ago. Take a look at it. The functions aren't a poor fit, and I used $\exp(x)$ rather than $\exp(kx)$ for simplicity in presenting the ideas without having to refer to k in the derivative for example. In general we can use $\exp(kx)$, $\exp(-qx)$, etc. for constant k , q or phase constants k , q , and similarly for hyperbolic sine and hyperbolic cosine functions and quadratics and linear functions with changes from x to kx , $x \pm k$, etc.

What you're ignoring is that nobody else is fitting anything at all analogously to me – they're still in algebraic geometry and algebraic topology and Lie groups/Lie algebras and the likes of that trying to find the "holy grail" before they actually find a "concrete" Quantum Gravity equation that is easy to recognize. If you recall the problem with King Arthur's or Prince Launcelot's Sword in mythology, everybody but the "right person" tried too hard with brute strength (in this case with over-complicated mathematical machinery).

Osher

.