

File 20110725.1915: I had an interesting experience explaining my thesis to Craig Christensen today before the demo. He was a good hostile audience and offered to discuss it further after a week after 15th August when I've turned in my written work and he has turned in a proposal. I made several mistakes in what I described to him and Kevin and Dave Neal. I felt like I was spinning a line of BS.

I have got to be more eloquent about explaining this. *Do not* talk about the earlier trajectory-based theory, ever. It just isn't worth it. The springs and plywood bit makes it sound trivial, and I am not at all sure anymore that predicting the equilibrium configuration of a chaotic system—if indeed it is chaotic—is even possible from ‘three points along an orbit using Kepler's Laws’. **Just drop it.** Talk about the grounded theory, and your accretion problem model in detail, but not the ‘tame covert channel’ idea. That is too speculative and I don't know if it is even going to work.

References