

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg01955.html>

- *From:* theman <genericjoe2005@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 26 Mar 2008 12:40:46 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 26, 2:24 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
<snip>

Post the link where you found the paper prove me wrong....

<http://books.google.com/books?id=Fvs3sw9ZVfsC&pg=PA111&lpg=PA111&dq=q...>

He says the Lorentz transformation may be interpreted as the correspondences between internal worlds. Page 114

You don't even know what the lorentz transformation is... not to mention to say that you'd have to show that mathematically since the lorentz transformation is a mathematical concept...

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lorentz_transformation

read the article understand the math, turn monads into a mathematical concept, and prove it... you can't prove it, you don't understand the math.. and you cite a source that doesn't prove it, so hence I say your still wrong...

That's nearly what I said about time dilation and relativity in my model:

Nearly doesn't count... not to mention the fact you don't understand the math and thus cannot make or prove an argument on that point.... and since you don't understand physics by your own admission your not qualified to make these statements... your in fact to stupid to understand the implications of your own ideas, ie no implications, or even how to prove them... and too foolish to admit your wrong when shown...

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

"I described a singular virtual environment. (first set of information)

No you said develop a computer model of the world.. that doesn't imply a virtual environment... if you knew anything about modeling in science you'd know that one doesn't imply the other.... so you actually did not propose that... the difference between VR and a scientific model... idiot... you use them interchangeably and their not...

I also said there will be an internal observer, which is really a model of the virtual environment in the virtual environment (second set of information).

No you said to sets of information one is completely virtual, which is of course bullshit since you cannot have purely virtual resources... and you specified the observer comes from the complexity of the model, more bullshit... you never made the same argument about the observer... in fact you still have failed to read anything about observers in models... hmmm big surprise... your just in love with your own worthless ignorance...

I should have said there should be internal observers. Plural.

Yeah, doesn't change anything... doesn't make your wrong argument right...

Many models within the model.

Your just parroting now...

Their variations are important.

Parrot...

I predict my conjecture will explain time dilation and length contraction by using more than one observer.
["http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics/msg/1da71af6012924f7"](http://groups.google.com/group/sci.physics/msg/1da71af6012924f7)

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

You strung random thoughts together and made little sense if you take them charitably.. of course I can stick a bunch of monkeys in a room with typewriters and eventually they'll compose Shakespeare... so your a monkey composing science... congrats... let me send you a banana

He also says "It is only after obtaining a mathematical formulation of monadology that we are able to know whether monadology is consistent with physics or not."

Yeah, and have you done that... no your to stupid to do that... this also what people have been saying for years... to you and did you listen no your mike helland boy genius who doesn't even know basic differential equations...

That's indirectly relevant, because until a conjecture becomes a hypothesis, it is not falsifiable.

It is falsifiable at all points conjecture or not... and your conjecture is false... sorry.... as shown by numerous people.. on this and other groups...

I admit my ideas have a ways to go along the steps of the scientific method.

You're using that to act as if they are still at the starting gates.

Because they are, as evidenced by the fact you don't understand physics... and can't possibly evaluate where you are...

But only your understanding of monadology. You have yet to take the first step to understanding: wanting to understand.

I comprehend your idea, and its wrong, as I have shown and others have too.... Just because you can find one paper that agrees with you is meaningless... esp. when the paper is an opinion paper... the problem here is your so ignorant you can't even judge what is a good source... in fact thanks to the internet you can find "scholarly papers" to support anything... you can find papers to support 32D SuperGravity theory, one of the most bogus theories of gravity ever... your citation proves nothing...

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

And in fact if you understood how to make a scientific argument you'd know that justing having on source is not good enough... sources have to be quality and they have to prove the point your making... the point your making requires a mathematical proof, neither you nor your source provide that... thus your ideas are nothing but piffle...

<snip> trash

<snip> mike being mike we know what that means...

Cheers

.