

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg00909.html>

- *From:* Michael Helland <mobydikc@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 10 Mar 2008 20:12:52 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 10, 3:26 pm, theman <genericjoe2...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 10, 6:10 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 10, 2:50 pm, theman <genericjoe2...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 6, 7:31 pm,
MichaelHelland<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.

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

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.

Mikeyou 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.

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?

Yes.

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

Here is the simple program in my paper:

* Setup Initial Conditions

```
public oAbsoluteMatter
oAbsoluteMatter = createobject("collection")
oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 10, 20, 10, 2,
0, 0))
oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", 1, 20, 10, 10, 0,
2, 0))
```

*Alternative Initial Conditions for a little more complexity

```
*public oAbsoluteMatter
*oAbsoluteMatter = createobject("collection")
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 10, 20, 10,
20, 0, 0))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", 1, 20, 10, 10, 0,
2, 0))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 10, 20, 10,
-10, 4, 1))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", 1, 20, 10, 10, 1,
-2, -1))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 5, 30, 40,
-20, 35, 0))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 605, 30, 25,
-10, 2, -1))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 100, 2, 10,
20, 50, 70))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", 1, 21, 10, 10, 4,
2, -10))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 12, 20, 10,
-1, -40, 1))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", 1, 2, 10, 10, 1,
-2, -1))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 5, 6, 40, -20,
65, 0))
*oAbsoluteMatter.Add(createobject("absoluteMatter", -1, 0, 4, 25, 10,
-2, -1))
```

do while .t.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

clear

for each oA in oAbsoluteMatter
oA.DoStuff()
endfor

wait window

enddo

* end of program

*class definitions

define class absoluteMatter as Custom

nType = 0

nX = 0

nY = 0

nZ = 0

nDx = 0

nDy = 0

nDz = 0

procedure Init(tnType, tnX, tnY, tnZ, tnDx, tnDy, tnDz)

this.nType = tnType

this.nX = tnX

this.nY = tnY

this.nZ = tnZ

this.nDx = tnDx

this.nDy = tnDy

this.nDz = tnDz

endproc

```
procedure DoStuff
```

```
* draw us visuall on the screen  
?str(this.nType) + str(this.nX) + str(this.nY)  
_screen.FillStyle = 0  
_screen.FillColor = iif(this.nType = 1, rgb(255, 0, 0), rgb(0, 0,  
255))  
_screen.Circle(2, 100 + this.nX, 100 + this.nY)
```

```
* move inertially  
this.nX = this.nX + this.nDx  
this.nY = this.nY + this.nDy  
this.nZ = this.nZ + this.nDz
```

```
* see if there's anything to interact with  
for each oB in oAbsoluteMatter  
lnDx = oB.nDx  
lnDy = oB.nDy  
lnDz = oB.nDz  
oB.nDx = this.nDx  
oB.nDy = this.nDy  
oB.nDz = this.nDz  
this.nDx = lnDx  
this.nDy = lnDy  
this.nDz = lnDz  
endfor
```

```
endproc
```

```
enddefine
```

<snip>Miketalking

The
mathematics

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

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.

Mikeyou 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.

Re: Absolute reality -> mind -> Relative Reality

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>

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:

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

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 and copying and pasting this has to be demonstrating superior knowledge of the physics he talks about you must cite your sources for each scholarly articles.

Cheers

I don't know the answer to those questions.

There are also plenty of chemistry questions I don't know the answer to. Or biology. Or astronomy.

My goal is not to advance any existing scientific field.

I don't have any new details.

My goal is to promote an accurate big picture, and let that guide us toward new mathematical expressions.

I don't expect anyone to join the revolution on account of what I have to say.

I do expect there are plenty of people already taking part in that revolution, and I hope to meet up with them. (I've read about Wolfram, Lanza, Smythies and a handful of others).

How can you revolutionize something you don't understand I asked basic questions and yet your still ignorant...

Your argument is I can't solve the Schro. wave equation, thus, could not revolutionize how it is done.

I completely agree.

I've said that before.

I also am more critical of myself than you are.

My conjecture and subsequent discussions with neurosurgeons suggests a more profound understanding neuropsychology is also required to complete the revolution my dumbass is suggesting.

So my dilemma is, do I study quantum chromodynamics?

Or neuroscience?

As I slowly work toward one of those ends (having no funding) the prospect of collaborating with someone that has studied one those topics is worth pursuing.

Re: Absolute reality → mind → Relative Reality

Which to you is worthy of insult.

Hmmm... so you don't know what your revolutionizing but your revolutionizing it.. yes, your dumber then expected...

Physics is just a branch on the tree of knowledge.

The shift in thinking that will occur has a much broader scope.

.