

Re: Proof that macintosh is better than VMS

Source: <http://unix.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.os.vms/2008-03/msg00568.html>

- *From:* AEF <spamsink2001@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 12 Mar 2008 17:13:00 -0700 (PDT)
-

On Mar 12, 5:16 pm, Doug Phillips <dphil...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 11, 8:03 pm, AEF <spamsink2...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 11, 1:14 pm, Doug Phillips <dphil...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 11, 2:16 pm,
koeh...@xx (Bob
Koehler) wrote:

In article
<960d254f-6ae7-4334-ab8e-e58e2b1ed...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>,
Doug Phillips <dphil...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
writes:

You are confusing quantum
mechanics math with
reality. If you mean
that the mathematics of
quantum mechanics is not
concerned with
resolving apparent
randomness, then you are
correct. You might want to
look into the de
Broglie-Bohm theory, more
recently called Bohmian
Mechanics.

Quantum mechanics math vs. reality? You
think reality differs?

Re: Proof that macintosh is better than VMS

I believe that reality does consist of probabilities, but QM math is vague by design and accepts those probabilities as "good enough" because in most cases they are.

QM math is not vague. The wave functions are well determined and so are the probabilities for the various outcomes therefrom.

I'll reply here, once, against my better instincts, and hope to address most of the questions/points you directed at me in this thread (and the rest of your post which content I've left intact at the bottom.)

I don't claim any special understanding or adherence to any of the ideas presented by the following references. Most have been debated elsewhere and google should find some of the discussions. You might already be completely familiar with all of them, anyway, but it seems you're not from what you've said -- or if you are maybe you have previously dismissed them as garbage.

Papers regarding GHZ

<http://eprintweb.org/S/article/quant-ph/0007102>

Hmm, they want \$31.50 for this one. I'll pass.

<http://eprintweb.org/S/authors/All/un/Unnikrishnan/21>

I think I read a paper by this dude once. I discussed it with my graduate advisor and he agreed it's bogus. But this may .. OK, I just checked it. This one is free. Yeah, I think it's the same author and it's probably bogus. The other paper I read by him (probably around 2000) deduced that the wave function IS deterministic, but everyone knows that. My adviser said all he did was re-derive the Bell stuff in an strange way.

If this were really showing what it claims, I think he would have won a Nobel prize by now. It's probably bogus.

AEF

Re: Proof that macintosh is better than VMS

[...]

.