

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00892.html>

---

- *From:* theman <[genericjoe2005@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:genericjoe2005@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 10 Mar 2008 14:50:55 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mar 6, 7:31 pm, Michael Helland <[mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:  
<snip> worthless mental sputum, or snot....

"What is NKS?"

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>

Congrats you cited a source....

You believe mathematics requires equations.

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

Mike you have never had a single NKS idea in your life, your theory doesn't fit in NKS, sorry that won't save your idea from the utter failure that it is.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

The issue is that NKS relies on simple programs, your idea doesn't  
sorry mikey your wrong.... by the way do you even know what a simple  
program is?

<snip> Mike talking

The mathematics for QM are not the only ones.

Hmmm.... and how would you know since you don't show any understanding  
of math for example what is the 1 dimensional form of the Fourier  
Transform? Any idea?

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

Leibniz.

Leibniz if he was alive today could solve the Schroedinger equation,  
you can't thus I bequeath thee the title of Mikeus Ignoramus  
Maximus...

<snip> babble

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

Mike you have no idea where the tunnel is much less where the end  
is...

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

Oh wise Mikeus Ignoramus Maximus please teach us.... tell me oh  
teacher what is entanglement? What are the mathematical equations that  
describe the state of two entangled atoms?

<snip>

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

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.

Thus why nothing will ever be explained by your hypothesis because nobody would spend as much time as you have on this dead end. You have spent four years and gotten nowhere, you just waste your life coming up with wrong ideas...

So lets do a little informal test to prove me wrong Mikey boy:

Don't worry these are topics you have mentioned and I'm sure you understand already, in fact I'll give you the titles of the books where the answers can be found and since I am sure you already have an extensive library on the topic of physics you probably own these books.

So lets begin... the Mikeus Ignoramus or not test:

Books:

Quantum Theory by David Bohm

Theoretical Nuclear Physics by Blatt, Weisskopf

Question 1: Give me a definition of what a harmonic oscillator is and its function in Quantum Theory.

Question 2: What is the mathematical formulation of the first conservation law of nuclear reactions?

Question 3: What is an example of an adiabatic change?

Bonus Question: Define for me the Pauli Principle in your own words

Bonus Question 2: What is the Biot–Savart Law in your own words?

No using wikipedia mike and copying and pasting this has to be mike demonstrating is superior knowledge of the physics he talks about you must cite your sources for each scholarly articles.

Cheers

.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality