

## Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00545.html>

---

- *From:* Eric Gisse <[jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jowr.pi@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 6 Mar 2008 14:50:59 -0800 (PST)
- 

On Mar 6, 9:33 am, Michael Helland <[mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

[...]

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.

NO, IT IS THE ONLY WAY. The mathematics that physics uses HAS NO ALTERNATIVE. If you want to produce numbers, you use mathematics. It is as simple as that.

But you can use mathematics without equations.

Do you even THINK before you write? Seriously. Did you actually think "but you can use mathematics without equations" is something other than a stupid thing to say, or am I at the receiving end of your unfiltered mental spray here?

The mathematics for QM are not the only ones.

You have never even solved the Schroedinger equation. How the fuck would you know?

I'm sure they aren't even the best ones.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

How can you be sure? You have no concept of what you are trying to discuss.

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

No, you are not. You have no understanding of what modern physics has to do, so how can you possibly believe you are capable of reinventing all of physics?

I understand what modern physics has to do.

No, you don't. You might think you do, but you don't.

If you pass the MMX and Young's Double slit experiment you're half way home.

Not even fucking close. NOT EVEN CLOSE TO BEING RIGHT. Stop talking to me until you open up a modern physics textbook. Somehow things like the photoelectric effect, gravitational lensing, and gravitational radiation just...evade your understanding. Can't imagine why.

.