

# Quantum Consummation

By Alexej Savreux

Tommy Aqua's Journal of Philosophy  
vol. 1 (2020)

As far as objective reality is concerned, we shall immediately dismiss it as being 'non-primary.' Staying the claim for determinate reality, i.e., the idea that there are particles with simultaneously definite positions and impetuses, is irreconcilable with our thesis or the immediate definition of 'the immortality of the consciousness.' In the mid-1930s, Einstein discovered what he instantly (misconceived) to be a paradox that disproved quantum theory. His various experimentations showed that QM predicted the outcome of the following experiment to be farcical:

'Consider a particle passing through a slit of width  $d$ . The slit introduces an uncertainty in momentum of approximately  $h/d$  because the particle passes through the wall. However, let us determine the particle's momentum by measuring the wall's recoil. In doing so, we find the momentum of the particle to arbitrary accuracy by conservation of momentum.'

Einstein's objective here was shallow and claimed, thus, to deny determinate reality. He suggested that QM was incomplete, but when these thought experiments were carried out in the 1980s, they led to a divergence in consensus, as evidenced by Einstein as being inaccurate in his predictions and analysis. As a result, QM became the vehicle that many physicists commandeered to lead scientific intrigue into the arms of the 21st century. For example:

The riposte:

'Bohr responded that the wall is quantum mechanical as well and that to measure the recoil to accuracy  $\Delta P$ , the momentum of the wall must be known to this accuracy before the particle passes through. This introduces an uncertainty in the position of the wall and, therefore, the position of the slit equal to  $h / \Delta P$ . If the wall's momentum is known precisely enough to measure the recoil, the slit's position is uncertain enough to disallow a position measurement.'

We are by no means offering endorsements of parallel universes; however, these proposals must be accepted, especially if they impugn or impinge upon the aesthetic perceptions of dissidents of these very theories because causal systems are prone to evolution (and the whole point of existence is evolution). Likewise, these causal systems evolve through established, recursive computational procedures, which means they sort through all possible constituent components to engender multi-compartmentalized states because they cannot produce one oversimplified, or rather one, naturalistic linear history. If you live in a causal world with consistent rules and variables, then you know that death should be nothing more than a fleeting notion of self-generative anxiety.

We have said publicly that the claim that a conscious being can 'die' is a claim that the conscious being is an entity made of perishable dust above the laws of physics because he or she is unique, some automated machine picks apart the universe, preventing that very discrete configuration of matter from ever being built again anywhere in the universe – but evidence shows that a conscious being is a discrete orderly configuration of matter– as such, it is repeated throughout the universe of the entire causal structure of the universe by definition– quantum immortality is the rational analysis of the logical structure of causality– death is a false, terribly misleading purported concretization concocted by the natural human proclivity to explain the impossible (which is, in Freud's words, 'the consciousness contemplating cessation')

Despite my mystical caveats at the beginning of this essay (suggesting subjective reality as primary), such a conclusion may still seem to be a byproduct of Eastern thought instead of the more generally accepted, 'Western' thought considerably so since it is essentially 'Western' thought which is deemed more scientifically astute. We believe a dissident of QM and Quantum Immortality or, in a more plausible sense, reincarnation can see that the ascribed consciousness, as a strictly physical phenomenon instantiated by the brain, creates a world subjectively immune to its disappearance. The very finitude of a self-reflective cognitive system bars it from witnessing its beginning or ending and prevents there being, for it, any condition other than existing.

Death is impossible.