# *Theory of mechanical information*

Thursday, 4 April 2019

## Atomism

In physics we learn how simple the physical world is. We learn the lesson learned from unlearning the supremacy of complexity that was distilled from the experience of the affairs of society. That the metaphysical worlds of our society have virtually no reflection upon the physical world, which is simple.

It can be an exhausting journey to come to some familiarity with physical objectivity because we are most familiar with the metaphysical frames of reference that permit the arbitrary complexity of social relationships and communication. In the physical reference frame we are challenged to discard, first, the metaphysical frame of social reference, and second, the metaphysical frame of person reference. The latter encumbered by the language, experience, frustration, violence, and habit of self preservation, and the former being the source of that learning as the experience of the persons, representations, and projections of others.

There is a magnificent conflux of physical and metaphysical worlds in our computing machinery. The machine, itself, is simple. The computing machine is the manifestation of the confluence of physics and reason. To our seemingly endless realization, physics and reason collided to produce something simple. Of course this occurs in every application of our disciplines of physics, and the computer is sibling to every other product of physical technology. Nonetheless, we must pause and reflect before proposing a conjuction of physical and metaphysical because the worlds of metaphysical frames of reference are diverse beyond common familiarity with metaphysical objectivity.

In either branch of objectivity, we employ a frame of reference which primary tool is objectification. In the process of the acquisition of language, we first must discover objectification before we can employ association to put it to work. We develop the understanding that a name associates to an object of perception and we are born again as atomists. Curiosity in the flux of awareness explores the named object.

Our identities and their descriptions are always finite. This, permanent, character of information produces a dual conscience and conceit of physicality. As a physical representation it is but analog, and therefore

it is metaphysical. As physically represented it is finite and must be qualified to represent. The physicality of information is mechanical, when we err in offense of qualification we are found in the conceit of physicality. When we conserve information we are found in the conscience of physicality.

As we apply machinery to information, we confront metaphysical objectivity from the avenue of a physical frame of reference. When we employ mechanical information to the handling of the products of physical scholarship, we are fully prepared to understand our prospects. Otherwise, we are naive. The subjects of our own folly. And we have learned as criminal to project and exploit the results.

We are, therefore, obligated to identify physical and metaphysical objectivity as frames of reference for handling information. That the mechanical information lies in the physical reference frame of the machine, while the subjective information lies in the metaphysical reference frame of the user.

# Object

Experience with physical information reveals the following lessons.

- An archival object must be self evident.

- A interactive object must be self sufficient.

A coherent pattern is evident. There exist principal members of mechanical information space, and these share an atomism of mechanical information.

We may conceive of atomism in mechanical information space as utility of facility. A mechanical information object affords utility by design. Design determines utility, but the utility of facility will be measured in the experience of usage, regardless of the mysteries of its origin.

Atomism represents the future to design, and the past to experience. In the design of archive objects, the Atomistic future in experience may be tactile. A study of usability discards familiarity and confronts infamiliarity.

Atomism represents necessity to design. In the design of principal objects, the recognition of necessity discards the comforts of achievement to confront the demands of reason beyond the conveniences of rationale.

When we open the object to inspection or review, do we find what we need to integrate that object with foreign automata? To what degree would a foreign automaton be able to use the design object? Is such a perspective incorporated into the design program?

The object of an Atomic design program is an observable. The substance of observation is information. The object is a composition of information. Atomism requires a reasonable degree of accessibility, usability, readability, and completeness as enables a foreign automaton to use the object as designed, and enables a remote user to comprehend the object as applied.

Theory of mechanical information
John Pritchard, @syntelos

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xUB8Ophl5Xvn_ch8-LmgblUeL0SiDfqR1VaxhNm2erw/edit?usp=drivesdk