

More Reflections On The Trajectory Of Mine, This Time From Quantum Physics

By Kevin A. Sensenig
Draft 1.01
2019 June 5

From an email I sent today to a colleague.

Subject: More reflections on the trajectory of mine, this time from quantum physics

[Recipient],

Quantum jumps are not instantaneous, but gradual and continuous, new experiments show.

From a Quanta Magazine article:

Flash of Insight

The experiment shows that quantum jumps “are indeed not instantaneous if we look closely enough,” said Oliver, “but are coherent processes”: real physical events that unfold over time.

The gradualness of the “jump” is just what is predicted by a form of quantum theory called quantum trajectories theory, which can describe individual events like this. “It is reassuring that the theory matches perfectly with what is seen” said David DiVincenzo, an expert in quantum information at Aachen University in Germany, “but it’s a subtle theory, and we [the physicists] are far from having gotten our heads completely around it.”

– from the article “Quantum Leaps, Long Assumed to Be Instantaneous, Take Time”

https://www.quantamagazine.org/quantum-leaps-long-assumed-to-be-instantaneous-take-time-20190605/?mc_cid=855d7cb8c8&mc_eid=2beaeb5c0

With respect to my efforts:

“coherent processes”

“real physical events that unfold over time” (note here Nagarjuna’s statement that “when we see the fusion of the abstract and the concrete, we see the real world, before us” – and how I manifested that – but because of psych unit psychiatry’s refutation of the applicability of the abstract, and denial of my voice or standpoint, and rejection of reason on the table, and rejection of any idea of merit, and misrepresentation of the concrete, it could not see the real world, the actual, at all.)

“trajectories theory” (and this pertains to Minsky’s “The Society Of Mind” and “The Emotion Machine”, also; in addition, note Minsky’s ‘trans-frames’, his (my term) ‘combinatorial unfolding interconnected relational action-memes’ (the triangles diagrams) for a compelling model of the unfolding mind and function, and my inversion of ‘uniframes’ to model the (flawed) DSM)

“it’s a subtle theory”

“we [the physicists]” (read: eventually, “we, the psychiatrists”)

:-)

Just a footnote: Schrodinger, a physicist from last century, didn't like the instantaneous theory that had been proposed, so he's right. We studied the Schrodinger Equation in physics at F&M at one point, a wave-state equation for the atom and the electrons, and derived an elegant proof. I don't remember the proof, but it was elegant, and I remember that. So that was prescient, on F&M's part! (Schrodinger didn't like random either, but it apparently has been shown that 'random' is part of nature, so he's wrong on that. A story: one of my classmates and friends at Messiah College one time hit upon the term 'Random!' in applying to me, so he called me 'Random!' and 'Senseless!' after that. But the Talking Heads had a song called “Stop Making Sense”. :-) I have a followup question, for physics, that I hit upon today and that others may have probed: Is random in nature computationally derived? That would be Mind indeed!) (Recall my question in one of my papers: is the relational mind?)

Kevin