

Objective way of thinking using mathematical principles

[Sociology](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

My research concludes to achieve an objective way of viewing the world, the mind needs to be trained to view one's own life as a SET of different classes of experience which includes the Visual Experience. Then one should seek to establish for each class of experience, what classes of knowledge are required for that class. For the Visual class of Experience, one realizes that all that can be acquired are those classes of knowledge that the individual's senses can receive without any interpretation. This reasoning can be set out in the form of a series or SET of equations

1/ Life is made of a series of experiences

i. e. Life = sum of a human's experiences

2/ These individual experiences can be gathered together into different classes or SETS - I. e. sharing the same characteristics

3/ One of these classes is the 'visual experience' e. g. viewing the world that surrounds us for which the ONLY class of knowledge one requires to satisfy this class of experience, is that which can be gathered through the specific human's senses e. g. for the sight sense, 'colors that form shapes'. This applies to all the members of reality that make up the world that surrounds us. No further interpretation is required or can be made through the 'visual experience'.

[See also the solution to Big Question 2 which details how the personal TEMPLATE works. For it includes what classes of knowledge the senses can detect and those that cannot be detected I. e. complete SET that can be used to represent any human.]

4/ Thus by adopting this thinking strategy of accepting what one receives through the senses without personal interpretation I. e. subjectivity

[perceptions], everyone would be able to see the same/real world rather than seeking to create their own world.

My appreciation for Roger Penrose's essay asking "What is a reality?" was diminished because he gave no clear-cut definition of what he means by "reality" (18 November, p 32). As a result, the discussion seemed like nothing so much as an overview of the implicit etymology and current range of English-language meanings of that word. One can easily imagine dictionary definitions that either include or exclude physical events at the quantum scale or human mental events such as unexpressed thoughts.

I am not a linguist, but I suspect that the words for "reality" in other languages may not exactly coincide with the English meaning that Penrose assumes, whatever that may be. Even within the confines of the English language, philosophers devote their lives work to developing and defending definitions of reality and other indeterminate concepts. Perhaps Penrose could offer a dictionary definition of "reality" as a starting point for understanding his arguments.