The works of Brett Nortje part twelve [23rd November – 27 November 2013]

## New particles.

If we were to get into hybrid particles, as we discover new things all the time, we could also make our own new particles, yes? what could we do with them? an example of this would be like carbon monoxide, which is artificial nearly, but cannot exist without there first being a fire or something. of course, carbon monoxide is very stupid to make, as there isn't really any use for it. but, imagine merging or colliding all sorts of new things together, to see what we get? it could result in an explosion though, but hey, alls fair in love and science!

So we got our atoms, where to from here? i suggest we try to use a laser to shoot through two particles from one side, and put some force behind it. then, the particles will be smashed into one thing as they merge due to the heat, yes? then we can really experiment!

## Sweating diseases out of the bloodstream by chemistry of theirs.

If we were to think about it, we could easily sweat out diseases by using the right sort of chemicals, as there are always chemicals that kill other chemicals, and, let's face it, diseases are made out of chemicals. so, which chemicals do we need to get rid of the, for example, aids or cold virus?

If we were to use blood to flush the system, all we need to do is flood the blood with chemicals that sweat out non native cells. to do that, we need native cells, and something that pushes them out. enter the new white blood cell! if the white blood cells were to, instead of trying to kill or whatever the virus - or non native cells - then they would just have to push them out so that they can be sweating out?

Or, by taking the chemicals we have, we could create a new blood cell! this blood cell will basically do as i said above, and maybe add some cells to help with the sweating, or, reminiscent of chillies or something, to help with the sweating.

## Solubility.

Ph values reflect solubility, i think. if the ph is different for some solutions, then it might or might not dissolve into the substance. to increase the ph of a substance - making it harder to dissolve - would mean that you need to add carbon monoxide or something, as that is very bad at dissolving, as it is waste. to decrease the ph - let's call it balance of the substance - thereby making it easier to dissolve, we need to add oxygen, as that is one of the most soluble things going.

## Creating a higgs particle for studies.

If this is so important, let's try to find a way to get it into mass production - excuse the pun! if the higgs needs some gluons to become workable, then we need to use thing attached to the gluons that will make them collide. i suggest that we put some electrons on one gluon, and some anti electrons onto the other. then, they will be quickly 'smashed' together.

Alternatively, we could try to make higgs particles by wrapping gluons around each other into a real mess, then we could try to get them to twist with more glouns, until a higgs is produced, if that would work...

## Inverse square a function of logarithmic perception -i/x^2.

I read this on another forum, apparently this guy once had an experience of light as made up by by equal and opposite exponentials, and it would point towards a anti-entropic universe. the sum is; i*ln''(z) = -i/z^2 as the location of the observer. he also went on to say that all perception might be logarithmic.

To find out if all perception is logarithmic, we need to first define what logarithmic is, so consulting a premium source is in order.

Quote by: **http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logarithm**

*The logarithm of a number is the exponent to which another fixed value, the base, must be raised to produce that number. For example, the logarithm of 1000 to base 10 is 3, because 1000 is 10 to the power 3: 1000 = 10 × 10 × 10 = 103. More generally, if x = by, then y is the logarithm of x to base b, and is written y = logb(x), so log10(1000) = 3.*

*The logarithm to base 10 (b = 10) is called the common logarithm and has many applications in science and engineering. The natural logarithm has the constant e (≈ 2.718) as its base; its use is widespread in pure mathematics, especially calculus. The binary logarithm uses base 2 (b = 2) and is prominent in computer science.*

*Logarithms were introduced by John Napier in the early 17th century as a means to simplify calculations. They were rapidly adopted by navigators, scientists, engineers, and others to perform computations more easily, using slide rules and logarithm tables. Tedious multi-digit multiplication steps can be replaced by table look-ups and simpler addition because of the fact—important in its own right—that the logarithm of a product is the sum of the logarithms of the factors:*

*\log_b(xy) = \log_b (x) + \log_b (y). \,*

*The present-day notion of logarithms comes from Leonhard Euler, who connected them to the exponential function in the 18th century.*

*Logarithmic scales reduce wide-ranging quantities to smaller scopes. For example, the decibel is a logarithmic unit quantifying sound pressure and voltage ratios. In chemistry, pH is a logarithmic measure for the acidity of an aqueous solution. Logarithms are commonplace in scientific formulae, and in measurements of the complexity of algorithms and of geometric objects called fractals. They describe musical intervals, appear in formulae counting prime numbers, inform some models in psychophysics, and can aid in forensic accounting.*

*In the same way as the logarithm reverses exponentiation, the complex logarithm is the inverse function of the exponential function applied to complex numbers. The discrete logarithm is another variant; it has applications in public-key cryptography.*

If the logarithm makes complex sums easier, or summarizes them, then it is good. to see if perception is all observed logarithms, we need to recognize the fact that decibels, are logarithms. so, seeing as how an observer has five senses, and one of them has been satisfied within logarithms, then how do we see the other four?

Let's start with sight? if a monitor or television works in pixels, then it is only reasonable to assert that we see in pixels too. this is because, no matter how far down you go, you are either seeing through a lot of little pixels, or one big pixel! that would be your eyes. is pixels satisfied within logarithms? Yes, because they are either complex things combined into one product, or, one simple thing that combines with your brain to register the visuals.

Then, our person whose name is secret, says that the macro model doesn't work yet. what is the macro model?

Quote by: **http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mathematical_model**

*A mathematical model is a description of a system using mathematical concepts and language. The process of developing a mathematical model is termed mathematical modelling. Mathematical models are used not only in the natural sciences (such as physics, biology, earth science, meteorology) and engineering disciplines (e.g. computer science, artificial intelligence), but also in the social sciences (such as economics, psychology, sociology and political science); physicists, engineers, statisticians, operations research analysts and economists use mathematical models most extensively. A model may help to explain a system and to study the effects of different components, and to make predictions about behaviour.*

*Mathematical models can take many forms, including but not limited to dynamical systems, statistical models, differential equations, or game theoretic models. These and other types of models can overlap, with a given model involving a variety of abstract structures. In general, mathematical models may include logical models, as far as logic is taken as a part of mathematics. In many cases, the quality of a scientific field depends on how well the mathematical models developed on the theoretical side agree with results of repeatable experiments. Lack of agreement between theoretical mathematical models and experimental measurements often leads to important advances as better theories are developed.*

I only found the macro model with regards to computers though, and that has to do with mapping. so, let's examine the mathematics models and see if we can make them simpler? Well, in computer science, you either skip a transistor or it works, or they are both on, or they are both off. simple stuff. But, i think he was referring to this...

*Model of a particle in a potential-field. In this model we consider a particle as being a point of mass which describes a trajectory in space which is modeled by a function giving its coordinates in space as a function of time. The potential field is given by a function* $V\!:\mathbb{R}^3\!\rightarrow\mathbb{R}$ *and the trajectory, that is a function*

$\mathbf{r}\!:\mathbb{R}\rightarrow\mathbb{R}^3$*, is the solution of the differential equation:*

$$-\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\mathbf{r}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t^2}m=\frac{\partial V[\mathbf{r}(t)]}{\partial x}\mathbf{\hat{x}}+\frac{\partial V[\mathbf{r}(t)]}{\partial y}\mathbf{\hat{y}}+\frac{\partial V[\mathbf{r}(t)]}{\partial z}\mathbf{\hat{z}},$$

*that can be written also as:*

$$m\frac{\mathrm{d}^2\mathbf{r}(t)}{\mathrm{d}t^2}=-\nabla V[\mathbf{r}(t)].$$

*Note this model assumes the particle is a point mass, which is certainly known to be false in many cases in which we use this model; for example, as a model of planetary motion.*

Which can be easily stated as if a particle of mass has a point in space time. if the particle has mass, and is inside the space of the universe, it can be mapped as if it were on a gps, except that the particle must be given three coordinates with it's vectors to as where it is. to calculate where it will be, we need to say it's mass adds to it's velocity, and, if outside any astral bodies, will not really be moving unless given force by an explosion or something. in that case it will move. if it is inside the astral bodies pull, then it will be moving towards the body, but if say inside our own ozone layer, it's gravitational pull downwards will accelerate.

If it is not inside our ozone's pull, then it will most likely be like a asteroid moving around saturn or jupiter, or, even our own moon. this will mean that it 'circles' the body, as well as being attracted to the body, but, it is because of the motion of the body itself, as our sun moves, earth moves, so the moon will move.

**I am sure there is an easier way to calculate!**

If you need to insert values to a formula or sum, and you find it difficult to know what the answers are, i want to make a system where the sum can be calculated with minimal effort. if the sum has values where the values of something like x to the power of 4 to the power of 9 are hard to calculate, then i suggest you could just add the powers together, for example, and leave it x to the power of 36, so it would be x36. then we could say, seeing as how it is multiplication, that x = 1, making x36 = 36, yes? that doesn't mean it works yet though! if there is only one x, then it can go down like that, easily, as the sums will be calculated on the 36.

If there are only a few 'letters' or 'symbols,' then the way to go about it will be to cross out all the symbols, and keep the numbers. doing it the other way around will leave you with a sum you will not come back from, as maths is a language of values, not imagination. now we could do that for all of the symbols, and then have a lot of values easy to compute! Then, we could lose the brackets or just write the sum out in easy to understand equations.

If it is [x + 5] [y / 3] then we could say that it is actually, dropping all the symbols, +5 /3 = 1.66, and, then we could say that it gets rounded up to a natural number, being 166! i wonder how that would fly?

**To clear it up...**

Okay, so that seems to be working now, some hesitate to say, but it is pretty easy now to do maths. if the values you seek to know are unknown, then simply fitting the value into it's own powers might help? this would mean, for example 18 goes into nine, so it would be two, 18 goes into 6 and three also, so it could be 3 or six too. i am not sure how to work this out though, but rounding up to get a positive number should suffice!

**How about scientific equations?**

If we look at maths now, if that works, it is pretty simple. there must be a way to make science simpler too, hopefully. let's get to it!

On wikipedia, i was given an equation where [CH3] 3CH. this makes isobutane. so, how would we work this out? this sounds hard! okay, so it looks like it is c3h3? if that is true, then the science looks easy! how about we look at something else, like, butane? okay, when i look at the diagram, it says there are two ends with three Hs, and the two Cs in the middle each touch two. this means, universally, that there are three points coming out of each 'molecular bond,' and that the Cs are always joined to other Cs. Cs are carbons, so, carbons we could say are always joined? maybe. that will of course mean there in chemistry is always Cs joining to other Cs and that the other 'branches' will be bonded to the rest.

Looking at ethanol, we find the same to be true again, but, this time there is an O molecule bonding with one H. so, it could easily be said that the Cs bond with as many Hs, and, that the same is true as was in the ideal of three Hs for each of the ends of the molecule, and three Hs for the rest. now we can also say that Hs are always on the outside, and Cs and Os are in the middle, but, must remember that all the Cs will gather at the one end, and the rest at the other.

## More on bonds.

Or, we could say that Cs combine when the number of Hs are less, thereby not making the 'drag' or pull from the thing into further away areas. this means that a C may only touch two other Cs - maybe this is a universal rule? in a diagram, a molecule can only touch two of the same type at most?

So, for our equations, we could solve all the questions by observing that that 'two on one rule' is universal. when it comes to equations, we could say that we can easily work out the equation by counting how many times a different bond hold a certain number of other molecules to it through the bonds. every molecule can hold three bonds to other molecules, and only two of them may be the same as the one it is. then, there can only be a certain amount of other molecules bonding together due to the strength of the molecule in the atom.

If the molecule is 'many' then it is able to touch more, as the strength of the molecule is high. take for example the flowers in your garden. if the garden is full of type [a] flowers, then it is obvious that it will be more reproductive than type [b], and, type [b] will cross pollenate with less flowers!

## Trying to get those chemistry equations to work...

Now, to work out the equations, we need to make our rules fit into it. to do that, we need to take also that they will try to be as close together as possible. if that is true, then the 'bunching' rule could be observed.

If we were to observe the chemistry equation [C6H5CH3 + H2] we will find this works the same as our maths equations. to work out the equation, we need to six Cs times by five Hs and so forth. so, we would need to drop all the symbols and work out the [6 x 5 x 1 x 3 + 2 =] 92 molecules or something.

Then, we could try to make it so that the 92 goes back into Cs and Hs. this would mean counting the Cs and Hs entries, and dividing them thus. so, we could say that there are 2 Cs, and 3 Hs, so, the ratio will be 2:3, yes? then, we divide 92 into 5 and split them, so the answer will be 18.1, leading to 181, then 60.05, leading to 6005, leading to 301. this split by 2:3, equals 180.4:200.6, leading to C180.4 and H200.6 i think...

## Trigonometry.

I find this to be easy, but am not familiar with expressions like tt or any of that. basically, to find the angles, which only go up to ninety degrees in a triangle, you need to just learn to work out opposite angle values. of course, if you are given some weird stuff to calculate, then maybe you will find it harder?

This means you need to observe that an angle is always 360 degrees at it's 'center' where the point of your triangle is. this is a circle! then, you need to work out the angles based on where the line goes - maybe if you were to observe that at next variable, it is not 360 degrees, you need two lines to make an angle, and, all triangles have angles. if you were to measure the distance away from the 360 degree circle to get the angles, then you would find that it will always change length, but not angle, unless it is curved or something. in the case it is curved, you may find that it has two similar measurements of a ruler to the angle it is part of, but, that may be on different lines. of course it might not have two similar lines, and this calls for common sense! if it looks like it is curved and part of a square or something, however curved it might be, there must be two measurements that are the same.

Then, you need to take two measurements of the angle, one at points of your choosing. if you were to take two measurements, you will find two different numbers. then you need to take a measurement of the distance from each line to the points you measured. then you need to calculate the difference between the two. confusing? vague? let's take an example!

If you have a thirty degree line from a curved line which becomes zero at it's origin, and thirty at it's most angled area, then you need to work out: 30 degrees minus the length of the points you measured on each side. it is curved, so take random points. the longer it is, the more curved it will be, but, the further from the circle of the origin it will be. if the circle is 360 degrees, and the length is say 40 mm, and at that point it is 20 degrees from the origin, you will find that 360 minus 20 degrees and 40 mm will leave you with 340 degrees per 40 mm! i think this is right, and, could be used instead of sin and all that rubbish, if it flies...

Of course, that is not really usable. if it were that you try to measure the distance and ratio it out with degrees, you will come to a value of a different kind than the one i messed up. the real value is: 360 - 20 / 40mm. this means, seeing as how you can take a measurement from anywhere, you should take a measurement that divides by ten or the angle value you have. then, you will easily work this out.

---

**Approximating pi for use in equations.**

I find, that, to approximate pi, you need to bring one of the numbers after the decimal to a zero. this would be 3.14285... so, to multiply this by two will leave you with a zero at the five, becoming 6.28560.

Then i suppose you would ignore the one, as it was times by two - leaving a half of itself! so, the one taking the place of the 0 would actually be a half of a half.

So, pi can be approximated as 3.1429.

---

**Teaching maths and english to children.**

If we were to try to teach maths to kids, it would be like learning a new language. this is why so much time is spent doing so. if it was made easier, then we could teach them better, or, have more time for revision at lower grades.

If we were to teach them the song, they will learn the numbers phonically. if we were to teach them the 'fingers,' we could show them how much each number in the song is worth. if we had a work book showing them what each amount of fingers looked like, like an outline of your hand with finger outlines for how many fingers each word is worth, then they could learn by themselves! this is how martial artists train - they teach their muscles, in this case the brain, how to work for them, and perfect each move as if it were a song, i would say.

To teach children of no first language how to speak and read and write, we would need to use stencils. each child should get a stencil for them to write and train their muscles how to write each letter. after they write a letter, they need to point at each letter when the song comes on. then, they need to learn how to pronounce each 'syllable,' 'letter,' 'word' or 'sound' into each other. then, they will learn to read by themselves, be able to replicate their ideas on paper, and know what most things mean.

---