

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

# Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg01752.html>

---

- *From:* theman <[genericjoe2005@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:genericjoe2005@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 23 Mar 2008 10:28:30 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mar 23, 2:31 am, Michael Helland <[mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

<snip>

neither applies... if I have issues they are on physics level with SR,  
these issues of citation are pre-physics issues...

Well, all I'm saying those are examples of something you could say  
about an idea regardless of what it actually is.

In that sense, they aren't direct criticisms.

Yes they are directed at you can this indirect direct thing is a weak  
shield that you've constructed to protect your own flawed ideas.

<snip>

Also made references to the Principia and Monadology.

I could cite them, but I'm making general comments about 300 year old  
texts.

Doesn't matter, cite your sources or your plagiarizing, not to  
mention what was science 300 years ago doesn't meet the bar of science  
today...

<snip> mike confused about the idea he uses

Besides, any wikipedia topic I mentioned has a bibliography.

Irrelevant unless you know that the person who wrote it is qualified  
to make the statements and is an authority on the issue, wikipedia

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me  
for you Mike is a shield to avoid reading real science books...

<snip>

not what was meant, the issue of going farther is are you going beyond  
what is currently thought about...

Ok. I understand.

My argument for taking it farther is Step 2.

<snip>

Learn about the issues in digital philosophy, in Kurzweil's case,  
being more of transhumanist he in fact sweeps the issue under the  
rug... read his work...

I agree.

so have you done it? read and informed yourself...?

In Cahill's process physics, time is somehow supposed to give rise to  
space and matter.

I don't think that solves the problem either.

Doesn't matter as Eric and I said Cahill's work has been disproved at  
this point it is really only interesting as a thought experiment not  
as real science. Not to mention it doesn't sound like you really  
understood the paper, did you actually read the whole thing...?

<snip>

not really the only way that happens if there is a direct benefit to  
using his ideas, you have not proved that nor cited sources to do  
so...

QM is begging for new ideas.

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

How would you know, you admit you don't know physics, and have never solved any key problems of quantum mechanics...

Maybe dusting off older forgotten ideas that coincidentally are claimed to have anticipated QM are what we need?

If they only anticipate QM then we are already going down those lines, for you to know they are relevant you'd have to know QM which you don't and you'd have to show that not only did the ideas pre-date QM, but that they also include important elements that QM leaves out.

<snip>

Yes your adding an irrelevant middle man, already been over that...

In brane mechanics, our perceived three dimensions occupy one brane.

In another, hidden brane, gravitons occupy other hidden dimensions.

Not really, look up string theory read the relevant research on branes, actually you've got the graviton thing all wrong, which if you understood physics you'd understand the point of branes and there intended solution to the problem of gravity...

My "middle man" is the link between those dimensions.

No its not it is just blindness and as my example which you have yet to refute, points out just adds needless steps....

You'll deny there needs to be a link.

No actually not, as usual you miss the line of argument completely

But some people have been thinking about these things.

You have been, thats irrelevant your not a noted person in these areas...

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Neuroscientist John Smythies has written some relevant papers.

John Smythies ideas that you'd think are relevant are unproven piffle, and actually are not the current trend in the research...

I think I should probably use his paper as a cite in mine.

You mean this:

<http://www.imprint.co.uk/pdf/smythies.pdf>

This is unfounded, unsupported piffle, it is completely unproven and has not yet been backed up by science... the theory manages to distinguish itself from pseudoscience by actually making predictions but none of said predictions have been tested, so so far its opinion not backed by fact... not the best paper to cite...

<snip>

Step 1:  
Why would you build a model of the world that doesn't work, that's a waste of time to do that intentionally...

ignoring code... since its just a "proto-hypothesis" worthless

<snip>

Directly applies to your idea...

It applies to any conjecture.

No it applies to your conjecture since your conjecture is the one making the claim we should build a model that doesn't work "This computer world doesn't have to be, nor should it be, perfectly compatible with the laws of physics as we know them."

Hmmm, I think the criticism applies perfectly directly to your

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

paper....

It's a subjective value judgment that places all worth on hypothesis and theory and none conjecture.

Conjecture is only valuable if it leads to hypothesis get used to it, if all you can do is conjecture then you'll never be taken seriously as a scientist...

<snip>

You're criticizing the uniqueness of one aspect of the paper, an aspect I've conceded is quite old.

It doesn't criticize the idea itself.

Most of my criticism of have been of the idea itself in–fact I showed that the core is just a worthless middle man that gets in the way of making predictions.

<snip>

Doesn't matter, one must define ones terms.... you have not...

What terms?

Any terms are defined mathematically.

not by you... not in the paper

Absolute matter is defined in the code.

no its not, just putting a name on it is not a definition, its circular and false one never should define a thing by the thing...

It starts with:

"define class absoluteMatter as custom"

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

and ends with:

"enddefine"

as I said... look up formal logic and the concept of proper definition....

I defined the terms in the mathematics (the code) which you chose to ignore.

You did not, your code is merely pseudocode which you claim to be a proto-hypothesis so you essentially said to disregard it... Further code is not mathematics computer code is computer science mathematics is equations you failed to use a single line from the language of mathematics, not a single equation...

<snip>

I have looked it up online.

Congrats.... lets see what horrors await bellow...

Depicting an observer as mathematical complexity resulting from simple laws seems to be the innovation of Process Physics.

no you didn't look it up apparently... try again lookup the text in google not related to the crank theory of process physics...

If there are others, you'll have no problems supplying information about them. Such as their names.

No mike then you'll add them to your list of buzz words, and misuse them at the next opportunity, not to mention I am not your tutor you need to do the work and learn the material and not expect others to spoon feed you...

<snip>

No not really because any simulation run on a computer all data in the simulation will be contained in the "physical resource"...

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Yes.

I agree with this.

Good, then you can abandon this idea at once

At least, at the present time, nothing has ever proved it wrong.

You just said it was wrong by agreeing that the one distinction you made didn't exist... the fact that your one innovation the completely virtual resource is a fake, you disproved your own idea, congrats...

In other words, what I'm suggesting is something that has never been done.

Yes because it doesn't work and actually that mistake has been made many time look-up perpetual motion machines and read some science fiction and you'll see your idea is not new...

In fact, you believe it is impossible.

Just like perpetual motion...

That's probably a clear indication that I've come up with a novel idea.

No its just a clear indication that your a fool and don't know what your talking about, and that your ignorant of the relevant work of others making you a crank, not a novel thinker, novel thinker is not equal to crank sorry...

The idea is, what if the monads defined in the physical resources arrange into their own structures, like atoms, molecules, cells, tissues, and organs, something very brain -like.

Yeah except thats not the idea you expressed in your paper... so change away... that is already being looked into, take a look into claytronics... look at any simulations of late of cells in the computer.... look at the computational estimates required in-fact SGI

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

I believe helped realistically model a virus in the computer...

That brain is an information store.

Yes and if its in the computer then the computer is the information store... if your trying to make monads into computational elements now you have to define how they work. For example what logic is used boolean, modal, natural, propositional, categorical, conditional, deductive, inductive, oh wait you don't even know what half of those are... does it use logic circuits or something different

There is a second set of information in there, in a unique resource.

Fine that is store in the hard disk....

It doesn't communicate with the first, it is a consequence of the information in the first.

Fine add  $2+2$  put result here , the computer does this all the time...

I thought I came up with this idea, but it's clear this is what Cahill is going on about (and I think Leibniz before us).

Yeah, again Cahill is a crank, you just read the stuff on the NKS forum about process physics didn't you. You never read the paper, you have a lot of the same misunderstandings as the people on the forum did...

So maybe I should add cites to Cahill too.

Sweet.

Sure then it makes your unsupported admitted by you to be wrong theory, backed up by disproven science, congrats, your dumb...

<snip>

Because I was wrong about that.

The paper needs to be updated.

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Instead of A.I., I've determined that what my paper indicates is a truly intelligent computer program.

Yeah the goal of AGI, your not going beyond the stated goals of areas of the AI field... learn about AI..

A program for simple laws of nature that yields complexity that can be interpreted as the program making observations and measurements of itself, and dare I say, experiencing itself?

Lookup AGI, and stop imagining, that your coming up with new revelations....

<snip>

nothing comes from complexity, complexity is merely a classification and a bit of an ambiguous one at that... look at complexity theory...

Nothing comes from complexity?

look at the formal definition of complexity, complexity is a state not an object...

Charles Darwin would disagree with you on that one.

No he actually wouldn't though charles darwin is another crank, who has a set of disproven ideas...

<snip>

That's why there is no algorithm for intelligence.

That doesn't solve the problem

It hasn't happened yet.

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

We can't say it won't solve the problem for sure until we do it.

So I walk off a cliff I can't say that I'll fall for sure until I do it? you moron test out your own logic and rid us all of your stupidity...

Nothing arises from complexity, except complexity and a pain in the ass when dealing with it...

Life comes to mind.

still wrong, look up complexity....

<snip>

Should be first not last...

Write a memo to information scientists.

Here's the memo you would get back:

In information science, step 3 occurs after the information processing task of step 2.

How can the task be measured for success before it is complete?

You look at what your proposing and through reason you run a thought experiment is this going to work or even make sense then you bother going through with it if it does. My point is you don't even get past the though experiment stage as evidenced by my examples...

<snip>

Again look into AI esp. AGI, look at neuroscience then come back, you don't know enough to make that claim...

Accomplished neurosurgeons have entertained my conversation with interest.

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Who? names.... not to mention most people will politely listen they probably thought you were just a dumb kid...

I know from their opinion that I've got some of these ideas straight.

Which ones? oh wait that's because you don't, yes if you take with utmost charity your statements one can make some correct statements, but the people you need to talk to are not neurosurgeons since the are your interested in is computational neuroscience and those people would tell you what I am telling you...

<Snip>

Leibniz's conjecture is like a theory where all the variables are hidden.

Impossible if there are no variables then you have no theory...

True.

Then why'd you propose it?

If the hidden variables yield the complexity of a new virtual computer.

And if the variables of that virtual computer match the outcomes of real experiments.

Then you have hypothesis.

Yeah which leaves out the fact you don't have a theory so you can't get their its like saying if only i had wings instead of arms I could fly, well you don't its wishful thinking...

The second set of information (second set of variables if you will) is the falsifiable element.

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Both are wrong both are falsifiable....

without a flashlight you can't see anything in absolute darkness...

I agree.

Then why do make the argument equivalent that you can...?

But the flashlight has to exist as the result of complexity of the monads.

No it actually in no way depends on that that is actually a logical fallacy known as a false dilemma

<snip>

that's meaning less since you have only hidden variables which is of course just a misunderstanding of hidden variable theory...

The physical resource has only hidden variables.

Then as you've agreed then if all the variables are hidden you don't have a theory or a model, then I apply the same argument here, and thus since things are not relative and we apply or I apply logic I disprove your statement with your statement. since you've already agreed that all hidden variables is ridiculous...

The visible variables exist in virtual resources of a neural network or something similar.

Bullshit....

<snip>

Really, well DVD, and CD are, but Hard Disks use a different write method and RAM and cache are solid state, I'd say there are some

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me

Re: If someone just took a minute to listen to me  
significant differences...

But they communicate just fine with each.

In the end they are all electrons.

In the end your made of atoms and thus your the same is a chair, and  
toilet seat, congrats, thats a worthless statement to make an what do  
you know you made it...

<snip, more bullshit>

All you've shown is that you have no sources, you have agreed to flaws  
in your argument that render the argument useless I see no more reason  
for you to post until you change your argument... congrats, now you  
have accomplished your mission in life to be the wrongest person on  
the planet earth....

Cheers

.