


From "Lost In Math" by Sabine Hossenfelder, Resolution

$\square \square \square \square \square$ S.H. 

"Ah, it can't be like that," G. says. We know $A_h \approx 0$, "G. < $\square \square$
The elementary particles can't be like that - $\square \approx \square \approx \square \approx \square$.
planets. We know they are exactly identical." $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
"There's no such thing as 'exactly' - it is $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
always to some limited precision," I point out. $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
"But I don't mean that elementary particles $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
are like planets," I explain. "Just that, $\square \approx \square \approx \square \approx \square$,
whatever is the theory at short distances, it $\square \approx \square \approx \square \approx \square$,
might not be simpler than what we have now. $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$.
Simplicity does not always increase with $\square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square \square$
resolution.

There is much to be said in praise and analysis of these
penetrating remarks by Sabine Hossenfelder.
First, though, let me focus on her use of the concept "resolution".
It seems to me to be an important philosophical/scientific idea,
related to focus and meaning specifically level of focus.

 RESOLUTION - LEVEL OF FOCUS

Now of course Alfred Korzybsky and Leibniz would agree with
not only the "no such thing as exactly" idea but also the "no such
thing as identity" idea. Both asserted the absolute individuality
(non-identity) of existents, both in time and space. I know with
certainty that A.K. did, and Leibniz definitely did by implication
with his monadology.