

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00556.html>

- *From:* Michael Helland <mobydikc@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 6 Mar 2008 15:31:15 -0800 (PST)
-

On Mar 6, 2:50 pm, Eric Gisse <jowr...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 6, 9:33 am, Michael Helland <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?

Yes.

"What is NKS?"

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

It is a new kind of science based on simple programs. Almost all the science that's been done for the past three hundred or so years has been based in the end on the idea that things in our universe somehow follow rules that can be represented by traditional mathematical equations. The basic idea that underlies A New Kind of Science is that that's much too restrictive, and that in fact one should consider the vastly more general kinds of rules that can be embodied, for example, in computer programs.

Instead of asking what mathematical equation some system obeys, it asks what simple program produces the behavior seen in that system. Pure NKS investigates how various types of simple programs typically behave – much as traditional mathematics examines various mathematical equations. Applied NKS then looks for simple programs behind the behavior seen in natural and other systems. "

<http://forum.wolframscience.com/misc.php?s=&action=faq&page=2#whatnks>

You believe mathematics requires equations.

You can't understand the alternative, nor do you want to.

Believers don't change their minds. They just die out.

The mathematics for QM are not the only ones.

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

Leibniz.

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

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

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

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.

If you can model enough classical phenomena to model these tests, then
yes, you are about 50% done.

It's not like there are more experiments regarding entanglement than
there are regarding classical electricity.

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.

The photoelectric effect is the basis of how a photomultiplier used in
Young's double slit experiment works.

If the experiment is to be explained by my hypothesis, the
photoelectric effect, along with a good deal of chemistry already has
to be present.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality