

The following 2 page letter to Garvin McCurdy by Scott Virden Anderson was sent 8/22/08

© Scott Virden Anderson

Garvin,

In working through the early sections of your “Initial Commentary,” I’m trying to understand what it is you feel is the substance of the “remarkable insight” you credit me with at the bottom of page 5.

With regard to the history of Planck’s discovery, my source reference ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planck%27s\\_law](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Planck%27s_law)) suggests some historical inaccuracies have become enshrined in the popular accounts. You might enjoy seeing how they tell the story.

But the main thing that stands out to me is your statement at the bottom of page 4 that “the human visible range is fairly well centered on the curve’s maximum.”

My recollection from high school physics is that the curve’s maximum is dependent on the temperature of the black body.

My understanding is that the curve you have shown is specifically that of a black body at T ~5000 degrees K.

That the sensitivity of the human visual system peaks here is due to the fact that solar radiation peaks roughly here as a result of the sun’s surface temperature (with only slightly modification by atmospheric filtering).

That Planck’s law applies across the entire SummaTime Scale may have important *theoretical* consequences that I have not yet grasped – by my reading of the general scientific literature however, its *practical* applications predominate *only* in the central portion of the STS.

One theoretical consequence that I have discussed at length, however, is that the distinction that Brian Green was trying to draw between “quantum scale” events and “macro scale events” is a false distinction – I take reality to be quantal, period full stop.

This I’ve attempted to develop via the notion of the PlanckPrint that you have not discussed in your Commentary.

Are there other implications that I’ve missed?

In your discussion of the STS, you seem to agree with Berney that my terminology leaves something to be desired.

Would your objections be satisfied if I changed Quantian to Quarkian perhaps?

The terms Gross, Subtle, and Causal are not my terms -- they are from the tradition of esoteric spirituality. I understand full well that they will “not sit well with trained physicists” since part of their training is to eschew anything that even remotely smacks of esotericism.

Thus, my intended audience here is the Yogi Physicist – fellows like John Hagelin, and maybe, Mark Comings – individuals whose have found these terms useful in understanding their own inner experience.

Perhaps you could say a bit more about how my terminology “leads one to the standard, action-time driven perception of rigid linear causality” (p7). I’m not at all clear what you mean here.

On the other hand, I do appreciate your drawing the distinction between characteristic time (CT) and characteristic transaction time (CCT).

With regard to the “Quantum Hyperbole,” this section leaves me totally baffled, I’m afraid.

I like the acronyms MEST and MESTIC.

The hyperbole you picture on page 10, reaching back now to my high school math, is generated by the reciprocal relation between frequency and wavelength given the SI units – I don’t see the role of Planck’s law here.

“The dynamism of the STS” is precisely what I deny in my extensive discussions of the PlanckPrint and the fact that the STS presents us with a *synchronic* and therefore *static* snapshot of reality – one that casts into question our very notions of time itself.

Maybe you can elaborate a bit further on what you are getting at here – I’m still chewing on the sections that follow.

In addition, I still remain unclear as well as to what exactly my “remarkable insight” was, in your view.

Best wishes,

Scott