

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00441.html>

- *From:* Michael Helland <mobydikc@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 5 Mar 2008 20:01:22 -0800 (PST)
-

On Mar 5, 7:29 pm, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 5, 10:40 am, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 5, 11:12 am, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 5, 9:32 am, Michael Helland
<mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 5, 10:30 am, Eric Gisse
<jowr...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 5, 9:23 am, Michael
Helland
<mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On Mar 5,
8:30 am,
Eric Gisse
<jowr...@xxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

On
Mar
5,

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

6:15

am,

Michael

Helland

<mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx>

wrote:

Both
Einstein
and
Newton
looked
at
the
universe
like
this:

Absolute
reality
->
mind
->
Relative
Reality

Newton
thought
his
mathematics
represented
absolute
reality.

Einstein's
mathematics
are
of
relative
reality.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

Has
anyone
considered
how
to
depict
the
entire
expression
(Absolute
reality
→
mind
→
Relative
Reality)
with
mathematics?

More
philosophical
bullshit.

It's a pretty
clear
challenge
for
mathematics.

Can
mathematics
replace the
entire
expression?

Since it took you several
years to learn freshman
level calculus, I
doubt you are qualified to
even ask that question.

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

Why
do
you
even
post?

Do you
have a bad
attitude
because
you're
trying to
impress
other
people with
bad
attitudes?

Or maybe I'm trying to
convey the feeling that your
philosophical
nonsense isn't appreciated.
How many years have you
been parroting
this bullshit? How much
closer are you to computing
a number?

I would guess I'm less than a decade from a
hypothesis that works for
all classical, quantum, and relativistic
phenomena.

Does that include actually learning enough mathematics and
physics to
cover that? I really doubt it.

"I was inspired by the remarks in these books; not by the parts in
which everything was proved and demonstrated carefully and calculated,
because I couldn't understand those very well. At the young age what I
could understand were the remarks about the fact that this doesn't

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

make any sense, and the last sentence of the book of Dirac I can still remember, "It seems that some essentially new physical ideas are here needed." So, I had this as a challenge and an inspiration. I also had a personal feeling, that since they didn't get a satisfactory answer to the problem I wanted to solve, I don't have to pay a lot of attention to what they did do."

http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/physics/laureates/1965/feynman-lec...

In the end our work is guided by reality. If all the currently existing mathematics and physics (

You are not Feynman.

You haven't studied physics at any significant level. You have no understanding of classical mechanics, special or general relativity, quantum theory, or any other fucking thing. You have spent the last four years or so spewing your nonsense onto this newsgroup and you are not one fucking inch closer to being able to understand – much less replicate – even the simplest things in physics.

In conclusion, shut the fuck up until you get educated.

I made computer programs that solved simple physics problems when I was 16.

I suppose I could have spent the last ten years studying more physics.

But I spent it writing more computer programs. You know. Work that people you pay you for because it improves their business.

Maybe you don't know.

The point is, unless there they are actually written on God's stone tablets somewhere, equations are just one possible way of doing physics with pen and paper.

I think I'm coming up with a physics based on a different type of mathematics.

.