

Fractal Unreality? – Paper V

Buchanan's article says that Tim Palmer proposes yet another alternative to those mentioned earlier – that **Kochen and Specker's** thought experiment is impossible and therefore inadmissible.

As you may have guessed, his key idea in overcoming this impasse is his **invariant set** (once more).

Now, are you sitting comfortably, for the next step in this revelation is a bit cute!

Ready?

Palmer asserts that the only physically possible states of the Universe are in his **invariant set**.

So, any state **not** part of this invariant set cannot physically exist! (that is certainly abstractions determining physical Reality if anything ever was, is it not?) Palmer interprets Kochen and Specker's thought experiment in the light of his (Palmer's) thoughts on the "fractal invariant set" of their assumed Universe, especially in separately performed experiments with different objectives of measurement. He dismisses their conclusions by saying that their arguments cannot be about the exact same Universe due to the fractal nature of the invariant set. He actually believes that their assumed Universes DO NOT and indeed CANNOT EXIST!

This, it seems is just what is needed and (according to **Spekkens**) helps to make sense of quantum mysteries.

NOTE: If all of this leaves you cold, join the club!

These so-called scientists have drifted so far away from Reality, that they really believe this rubbish. They somehow believe that they actually inhabit what I have termed Ideality, and that everything they can do **there**, is also in Reality. Indeed, it is a kind of super-Reality – the driving Essence of everything in Reality. So much so that they have turned their backs on Reality to concentrate more on their **essential World**, because it is there, they believe, that they will find everything.

So the above crucial points for adherents of Quantum Theory, seem to explain the inherent statistical nature (probabilities) of most quantum law. That "fractal" nature can only give solid results by statistical means – "The Quantum Theory only sees coarse grain approximations", it seems. Some of the excitement about this "approach" is that it gets away from the usual multiple Universes and unknown variables rubbish", we are informed.

But, I must say I see absolutely NO redeeming features in this amazing offering. It stands upon the very same mathematical ground, and just adds the new "spice" of Fractals to supply the "necessarily unavoidable" jiggling (This year's Random Noise- JS)

Finally we are told that when Palmer fully works out all the consequences of the addition of Fractals, ALL will be explained. I will not be holding my breath! How about you?

Conclusions

The series of papers included in this **Fractal Unreality** offering by the author had to be more of a statement of my position plus a commentary from that position on the contents of Buchanan's article. But a conclusion also seems to be essential, so here it is.

The assumed mathematical ground always leads us into a different World – that of Ideality, the World of Pure Form only, and then to apply its necessary rules of consistency as if they were the laws of Concrete Reality. They are not!

Fractals, in spite of what both Buchanan and Palmer say, DO NOT exist in Reality, in the way that they are dealt with in Ideality.

The reason that they do this is because they consider that Ideality provides the Essences and the components for everything in concrete Reality, and that is clearly UNTRUE! You cannot construct concrete Reality out of **formal relations**, which is all you have in Ideality. And though you can extract such formal relations from

concrete Reality, they are NOT the components that they are assumed to be. The very act of extraction assumes that what is gained exists of itself. It doesn't!

The World is NOT pluralist, but holistic, and the relations, though extractable by prodigious control of most other factors involved, are NOT independent of the conditions so formed. They actually *vanish* when the required context is removed.

Thus, though we can give the impression that they can exist independently of their context that could not be more untrue. Each and every extraction is only a sliver of the truth. The full Truth must include ALL of the rest of Reality, which is made CONSTANT (when possible) by the necessary experimental methods.

Fractals as investigated by mathematicians exist *as such* ONLY in Ideality. In the real concrete World, they are NEVER exactly like Fractals (and I DO NOT mean that they are just messed up a bit by noise).

Just as everything extracted and studied is distorted [purified(?)] by the methods involved, so it is with Fractals. Indeed, the most trumpeted feature of Fractals – their scale invariance, is exactly what is impossible in Reality.

To make any formal extraction a *cause* is childish to say the least, and there are sound grounds for labelling such ideas as Idealist in the extreme.

Abstracted Form does NOT drive Reality. Reality displays Form.

The World is Matter first, and Form a distant second, and NOT the other way round (unless, of course, you believe in God).

Clearly, any reader, even if they think the ideas in this rebuttal seem reasonable, MUST at this point be demanding a great deal more than my inserted fragments of an alternative philosophical standpoint, and requiring some exposition of the full position and its methods for investigation and understanding the World. Quite right!

But, as you will have seen from this large response (about twice as big as Buchanan's original article), NO argument could even be attempted without a huge helping of a totally contradictory standpoint.

To do that and approach some sort of justice to the alternative, could NOT be tucked into a review of a short article in New Scientist.

But that has been a mere two day's work, involving maybe around 5 or 6 hours writing.

The author has been writing on the general philosophical questions for 4 years and produced several million words on such topics. For those requiring a more rigorous exposition, can I recommend the author's own Internet outlet at the **SHAPE** subdivision of *eJournal* site.

(1,026 words)

Jim Schofield July 2009