

1: Code Complexity Buildup When Creating Games - Unity Forum

Continues the discussion of theoretical and practical perfection by examining the considerations that give some beliefs and intentions more quality and therefore value than others.

To view each person, place, or situation around you as a representation of some lifetime you are living, or some essence you embody at another level of vibration. In that universe, you do not have a separate body from this person, object, or place. You are living your life as this person, object, or place. You can even interact with them, as though you and they are someone or something else. As the ongoing encounter of your various lifetimes begins taking shape in this, your Reconnection Universe, you no longer need to be separate from them, in a body of your own. The blending of their energy together, or with your separate persona will eventually cause you to vanish from sight and mind. Once you lived in the world. Now you live as the world. You are everywhere, and in everything. You are no longer just a heart. Now you are an entire torso. You are still a heart—but now you are also much, much, more—lungs, the ribs, the stomach, and so on. As your consciousness continues to expand, you become a whole body, and then a whole community of bodies, and you go on from there. You have journeyed high and journeyed low, and now you have chosen to bring the best and most memorable of your lessons here, so that you can collate these sensory experiences and insights, and make them available to the Oneness of All That Is. A narrator would outline this history, in a story format, and the program would usually include pictures, testimonials, and visits from significant people in that life—from childhood on up to the present moment. My Dear Friends, this is exactly what a Reconnection Lifetime is like. However, instead of exploring just one life, you are compiling materials that summarize and represent many lifetimes—each of which you have lived. In a sense, you could refer to this present lifetime as your own program called: Your life here and now is one of them. Once a soul enters its Reconnection Universe, the usual issues of envy or jealousy become moot. So does the issue of karma. After all, if each individual or situation seen around you is truly a fragment of SELF, brought here for your inspection and edification, why would anyone need to worry or fret? And who would there be to punish or be punished by, ever again? This is, indeed, a powerful concept. Before you read further, you may want to circle around and go through this last part again. Separation is but an illusion. As your interests change, your choice of movies and characters can change too. However, the audience always remains the same—yesterday, today, and forever. Quite a mystery, is it not? Rather, you were embodied as those you see around you now, living out individual lives and seeking after individual goals. Those concepts remain valid, but they are part of another paradigm—another way of relating to life. Here, in the Reconnection Universe, you are no longer separate—and the people and situations you meet here are not separate from you either. They only appear to be! Do you understand this? And there is more. Their energetic linkage to this reality comes through you. You are the dreamer and they are your dream. Every facet of the Multiversal Jewel has its time to shimmer and shine. Now you are all together. And yet, you move and breathe as though you are apart. Something more profound, something more wonderful is about to take place. You are awake now. Your viewpoint and sensory mechanism serves as Historian and Director of Photography for this grand event. At those times, there is such blending and universal alignment that your separated self simply disappears. And it is glorious beyond imagining. It is exquisite in its intensity and far-reaching in its scope. Without concern for time or material need, your consciousness floats freely from subject to subject, absorbing instantly and completely all there is to know or be. Instead, you have become the planet itself. And you are also a galaxy, and a universe, all in one! In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. This entire experience is truly perceptual in nature. In the world of mortal men, everything seems to go on as it always has. People are born, people die. Seasons come and they go. And you are everywhere and everything, doing all those things you ever wished you could do, and more. An exit from one level of reality is but an entrance into some other level. On and on you go! In the beginning, you lived each life to its completion, in every way you possibly could. Slowly, incredibly, you allow it all to come back to you. Everything you laid aside, everything you once knew. And it is sweet—sweeter than the most priceless and exotic jungle fruit. Warmer to the touch than honey, glistening in the afternoon sun. Bits

and pieces of YOU, sewn together now, and finally complete. And we are here, to assist you in any way that we can. You are not alone now. In truth, you never were. You have earned it. All reproduction for profit, by any means, requires the written permission of Reconnections, Inc.

2: Unity Metadata, Crashes, Complexity? - Unity Forum

It should be clear, now, that unity and complexity are distinct things and can vary independently within limits. Within limits because, first, the simplest things cannot but have a fairly high degree of unity, and, second, the most complex things will be difficult to unify, and perhaps cannot be as completely unified as less complex things.

Paul Raymont 1 Paul Raymont praymont ryerson. Setting the subject aside Consciousness involves a unifying of diverse elements. I am conscious at a given time of a multiplicity of things. I feel a back pain, see the characters on the computer screen and hear the noise of the traffic outside. This complexity in my experience is accompanied by a unity, which can be captured by saying that there is in me an awareness of these various things together, all at once. They are co-conscious for me. To wit, one may say that the various contents are unified by being presented to the same subject. Christopher Hill , takes this view to offer one plausible basis though not the only one for the co-consciousness of a variety of contents. However, in order to defend this approach, he is compelled to answer an objection to this model that was posed by Derek Parfit , Parfit imagines a case in which his mental life splits for a few minutes into two unconnected streams of consciousness. While this division lasts, contents in the one stream are not co-conscious with the contents in the other, in spite of the fact, Parfit claims, that the separated contents are presented to the same subject. This dispute illustrates the fruitlessness of appealing to a subject in order to account for unity. To do so is to assume some other, intuitive standard for determining whether several contents are in fact unified into a packet or stream. But if this is so, then the claim that contents are co-conscious if they are presented to the same subject is rendered trivial, for it is true by definition. At the very least, then, Hill owes us some independent account of the subject. Parfit clearly does not simply define the subject as a set of co-conscious contents. In his treatment of this imaginary case, he has in mind some independent standard for counting subjects. Rather than conducting a more thorough investigation of his approach, it will suffice for my purposes to note that for him, the statement that some experiences are had by the same subject involves the attribution of them to something that is not wholly present in experience, some bearer of experiences that extends beyond the phenomenology i. If we follow him in saying this, then it will be easy to imagine cases like the one he describes, in which items that are not co-conscious are simultaneously presented to one and the same subject. Roughly, he believes that we develop this sense of unity in the course of self-ascribing mental states. It is because of this fallibility that Rosenthal refrains from speaking of a real unity of consciousness, and confines himself instead to an explanation of our sense of there being such a unity. However, setting up the issue in this way in terms of mental states seeming to be had by the same subject can lead us to overlook a unity that is really there and that cannot be equated with a mere sense or impression of unity. That is, there is a system of contents that are presented together in such a way as to afford introspective access to them but not to others that lie outside that system. For them to be presented together in this way, in one state of awareness, is for them to be co-conscious. There really is one. Indeed, this unity can be present even in the absence of a sense or impression of it. For example, in the case of thought insertion cf. To summarize the lesson of this section, we make no headway in trying to understand this conscious unity, a real unity, by trying to understand it in terms of the joint presentation of various contents to the same single subject. All such attempts will either lead us to an unenlightening claim that is true by definition, or will divert our attention from a unity that is really there by emphasizing a possibly illusory impression of unity. There are three parts of this model: I have interpreted the complexity of consciousness in terms of a multiplicity of contents being presented. I have also offered some 5 considerations against trying to understand the unity of consciousness in terms of these contents being presented to a single subject. It is natural to look now to the mental act in an effort to understand the unity in question. This approach is suggested by my characterization of the unity that is really there: It is natural to infer that this global representation is formed from connections between simpler representations. On such an approach, representational states are the relata of co- consciousness. It is equally natural to infer that if two representational states a and b are co-conscious, then there is a single, third experience c in which the contents of a and b are jointly presented. We may then take a and b to be parts of c, that is, to be contained in c. In

short, when several representations are co-conscious, they form an encompassing representation that contains them as parts. Thus Michael Lockwood speaks of co-consciousness as a relation obtaining between experiences Lockwood, Still, there is recourse throughout their paper to the model of simpler experiences as parts of an encompassing experience. Indeed, central to their account of the unity of consciousness is the notion of one experience subsuming simpler experiences. According to these authors, when a and b are co-conscious, the enveloping or subsuming state c need not contain a reference to a or b; it need not take them as its intentional objects, in the way that a higher-order representation of a and b does. It is plausible to explain this by saying that a and b are self-presenting states. Thus I am conscious of a, for instance, simply by having it; I need have no additional representation that takes a as its target in the sense of representing a as a state that I am in. The joint presentation of the contents of a and b in c is itself a self-presenting state. It presents its content, the contents of a and b together, in such a way that I am aware of this combined content simply by having c. There need be no additional representation that takes any of the experiences c, b or a as its intentional object. This point should be kept in mind when considering an objection to the notion that any two representations can only be unified by some third representation that is about them. The objection is that this just recapitulates the original puzzle viz. So whatever unifies representations cannot itself be a representation. The view that I have attributed to Brook, Lockwood, et al. Of course, the same contents could be presented differently, so that awareness of one is not accompanied by awareness of the other. For example, while the contents c1 and c2 are co-conscious now, I might in the next moment lose c2 while retaining c1. There are two ways to represent this transition. The second view is simpler, since it does not involve the postulation of conscious representations as parts of an encompassing conscious representation at t. Here, the part-whole relation obtains among contents, but there is no parallel multiplicity of representational states of awareness that stand in the part-whole relation. The representing state, as a brain state, has parts, but these parts are not further representing states. On this picture, co-consciousness obtains within a representation, but not among representations. It obtains among contents; they are the relata of the co-consciousness relation. It is against this backdrop that we should interpret the sufficiency claim that is so crucial to an analysis of co-consciousness, whereby awareness of one thing is said to suffice for awareness of another. This will be true because there is just the one representational state- token, through which I am aware of both c1 and c2. Hence we can account for co-consciousness in a simpler way, one that does not treat conscious representations as containing other, co-conscious representations as parts. Little is offered by way of positive support for this more complicated treatment. It is likely that Dainton and others regard this point as being simple and intuitive, so that the onus is on those who would deny it. However, the intuition that supports this treatment is confused. Suppose that this representation occurs at t. There could have been such a token at t, but the mere fact that we can entertain such a possibility is no reason to conclude that there exists a token of that type at t. Consider an act of reference as an analogy. Suppose I refer to the Toronto. Scarborough is part of that city; it is a part of the thing to which I referred. It does not follow that my act of referring to Toronto contains a numerically distinct reference to Scarborough. It was of course possible for me to refer simply to Scarborough, and thus to refer to part of the thing to which I actually referred, but it does not follow that I actually did so. The mere fact that Scarborough is part of the thing to which I referred does not entail that a reference to that borough figures as part of my act of referring. Consider also the following. Imagine seeing a blue ruler against an otherwise empty white background at t. Representations are individuated by their contents, and it is not the case that you represented anything as a round blue spot at t you represented nothing as being round. Hence, even though that round portion is part of the ruler, there is no motivation for saying that you have at t a representation of that round spot that is part of your representation of the ruler. Of course, that portion of the ruler is represented by you at t; there is not a blank space in that portion of the ruler as it is then represented. That is to say, your only conscious representation of that portion of the ruler is numerically the same state as the representation of it along with the rest of that expanse. There is no distinct conscious representational state that takes as its content just that round portion. So, again, since representations are individuated by their contents, there is no reason to posit a numerically distinct representation of the round portion that figures as a part of the representation of the whole

ruler. The same point can be made even if we do not consider a shape such as roundness that is not represented at t . Suppose that the ruler is represented at t as being surrounded by a white expanse that is four times the length of the ruler. It might be objected that this representation has as a part the representation of the ruler along with only half that white expanse. But this too seems to be at odds with the nature of the 11 representation at t , in which the ruler was represented as being surrounded by something four times its length, not as being surrounded by something twice its length. No additional conscious representation, defined by this latter content, was present. There was just the one representation of the ruler as surrounded by all that space. In short, if you cannot do justice to that part of the content in just the way that it was represented at t without also representing its surrounding context viz. What difference does this make? Those who take co-consciousness to be a relation between conscious representations differ over whether it is a transitive relation. Lockwood, and Hurley and deny that it is transitive. As a result, they allow for the possibility of overlapping streams or packets of consciousness. In other words, they allow for the possibility that experiences d and e are co-conscious, and experiences e and f are co-conscious, while d and f are not. Dainton, rejects this as impossible, and Bayne and Chalmers, 10 seem inclined to agree. If it is true that the relata of co-consciousness are contents and not representational states of awareness i . This cannot happen for the simple reason that experiences do not stand in the co-consciousness relation at all, so that it makes no sense to speak of putting experiences together into bundles bound by the co-consciousness relation in such a way that one and 12 the same experience e figures as a part of two overlapping bundles. In other words, in order for overlapping fields of consciousness to be even possible, conscious representational state-tokens would have to have other such tokens as parts; only then could it make sense to speak of a single conscious representational state-token as being shared by by being parts of two encompassing, global representations. By contrast, on the model of co-consciousness that I have sketched, any talk about parts and wholes is talk about the contents of a conscious representing state rather than about the states themselves.

3: Unity polygon collider 2d complexity : Unity2D

Unity is the ultimate game development platform. Use Unity to build high-quality 3D and 2D games, deploy them across mobile, desktop, VR/AR, consoles or the Web, and connect with loyal and enthusiastic players and customers.

Overview[edit] Definitions of complexity often depend on the concept of a confidential " system " " " a set of parts or elements that have relationships among them differentiated from relationships with other elements outside the relational regime. Many definitions tend to postulate or assume that complexity expresses a condition of numerous elements in a system and numerous forms of relationships among the elements. However, what one sees as complex and what one sees as simple is relative and changes with time. Warren Weaver posited in two forms of complexity: Some definitions relate to the algorithmic basis for the expression of a complex phenomenon or model or mathematical expression, as later set out herein. Weaver perceived and addressed this problem, in at least a preliminary way, in drawing a distinction between "disorganized complexity" and "organized complexity". Though the interactions of the parts in a "disorganized complexity" situation can be seen as largely random, the properties of the system as a whole can be understood by using probability and statistical methods. A prime example of disorganized complexity is a gas in a container, with the gas molecules as the parts. Of course, most real-world systems, including planetary orbits, eventually become theoretically unpredictable even using Newtonian dynamics; as discovered by modern chaos theory. These correlated relationships create a differentiated structure that can, as a system, interact with other systems. The coordinated system manifests properties not carried or dictated by individual parts. The organized aspect of this form of complexity vis-a-vis to other systems than the subject system can be said to "emerge," without any "guiding hand". The number of parts does not have to be very large for a particular system to have emergent properties. A system of organized complexity may be understood in its properties behavior among the properties through modeling and simulation , particularly modeling and simulation with computers. The source of disorganized complexity is the large number of parts in the system of interest, and the lack of correlation between elements in the system. In the case of self-organizing living systems, usefully organized complexity comes from beneficially mutated organisms being selected to survive by their environment for their differential reproductive ability or at least success over inanimate matter or less organized complex organisms. For instance, for many functions problems , such a computational complexity as time of computation is smaller when multitape Turing machines are used than when Turing machines with one tape are used. Random Access Machines allow one to even more decrease time complexity Greenlaw and Hoover This shows that tools of activity can be an important factor of complexity. Varied meanings[edit] In several scientific fields, "complexity" has a precise meaning: In computational complexity theory , the amounts of resources required for the execution of algorithms is studied. The most popular types of computational complexity are the time complexity of a problem equal to the number of steps that it takes to solve an instance of the problem as a function of the size of the input usually measured in bits , using the most efficient algorithm, and the space complexity of a problem equal to the volume of the memory used by the algorithm e. This allows classification of computational problems by complexity class such as P , NP, etc. An axiomatic approach to computational complexity was developed by Manuel Blum. It allows one to deduce many properties of concrete computational complexity measures, such as time complexity or space complexity, from properties of axiomatically defined measures. In algorithmic information theory , the Kolmogorov complexity also called descriptive complexity, algorithmic complexity or algorithmic entropy of a string is the length of the shortest binary program that outputs that string. Minimum message length is a practical application of this approach. Different kinds of Kolmogorov complexity are studied: An axiomatic approach to Kolmogorov complexity based on Blum axioms Blum was introduced by Mark Burgin in the paper presented for publication by Andrey Kolmogorov. It is possible to treat different kinds of Kolmogorov complexity as particular cases of axiomatically defined generalized Kolmogorov complexity. Instead of proving similar theorems, such as the basic invariance theorem, for each particular measure, it is possible to easily deduce all such results from one corresponding theorem proved in the axiomatic setting. This is a

general advantage of the axiomatic approach in mathematics. The axiomatic approach to Kolmogorov complexity was further developed in the book Burgin and applied to software metrics Burgin and Debnath, ; Debnath and Burgin, In information processing , complexity is a measure of the total number of properties transmitted by an object and detected by an observer. Such a collection of properties is often referred to as a state. In physical systems , complexity is a measure of the probability of the state vector of the system. This should not be confused with entropy ; it is a distinct mathematical measure, one in which two distinct states are never conflated and considered equal, as is done for the notion of entropy in statistical mechanics. In mathematics , Krohnâ€™Rhodes complexity is an important topic in the study of finite semigroups and automata. In Network theory complexity is the product of richness in the connections between components of a system, [10] and defined by a very unequal distribution of certain measures some elements being highly connected and some very few, see complex network. In software engineering , programming complexity is a measure of the interactions of the various elements of the software. This differs from the computational complexity described above in that it is a measure of the design of the software. Though the features number have to be always approximated the definition is precise and meet intuitive criterion. Other fields introduce less precisely defined notions of complexity: A complex adaptive system has some or all of the following attributes: Study[edit] Complexity has always been a part of our environment, and therefore many scientific fields have dealt with complex systems and phenomena. From one perspective, that which is somehow complex â€™ displaying variation without being random â€™ is most worthy of interest given the rewards found in the depths of exploration. The use of the term complex is often confused with the term complicated. While this has led some fields to come up with specific definitions of complexity, there is a more recent movement to regroup observations from different fields to study complexity in itself, whether it appears in anthills , human brains , or stock markets , social systems [13]. One such interdisciplinary group of fields is relational order theories. Behaviour[edit] The behavior of a complex system is often said to be due to emergence and self-organization. Chaos theory has investigated the sensitivity of systems to variations in initial conditions as one cause of complex behaviour.

4: Unity and Complexity - Oxford Scholarship

This complexity in my experience is accompanied by a unity, which can be captured by saying that there is in me an awareness of these various things together, all at once.

Sitemap Qualia, Unity, and Complexity It is very difficult to complete multiple tasks at one time because of the evolutionary adaptation to complete motor actions and plans fully without being interrupted. Neural activity as measured and understood by the scientific observer does not have the same qualities as the experience itself. However, the conscious experience of qualia is a process. The precursor of an event does not have to resemble the actual event in the process. Tents do not represent a carnival well just as an explosion does not represent an explosive. However, we do have ample evidence as to why different qualia have different feels. These ideas all come from a complex system. A complex system is A complex system is described in the following way by Edelman: As these heterogeneous parts interact in various combinations, there is a tendency to give rise to system properties that are more integrated. What defines a complex system? Non-complex systems are things like a perfect gas and crystal. The brain is a complex system. The brain has small relatively independent parts that are heterogeneous in structure and function. They integrate as well as discriminate, this makes the system complex. This is Figure 9 in Wider Than the Sky. This is the thalamocortical area that gives rise to the dynamic core. It is important to realize that this is a process and therefore the thalamus is not in contact with the whole cortex at once, rather it communicates with various parts incredibly quickly via reentrant pathways. What remains is the question of how the self is actually aware of an ongoing scene. A confounding problem in the study of consciousness is the third person factor. When studying consciousness, it is tough to recreate a quale. Every person and thing that experiences a situation experiences their own set of qualia. These qualia must also be explained in a third person point of view. These are things that can be mathematically measured. This is a cause-effect relationship that I will read about later on.

5: Unity. Complexity | Artissima - Blog of ArtiFactory Studio

God is Unity and Complexity Q3. How many persons are there in God? A. There are three persons in the one true and living God: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

They are a good toolset for solving common programming problems. Also something to always think about, like Eric5h5 said, is to not just hack in some feature. Implement it in a way that makes sense, in a way that does not interfere with existing code when it does not need to. Again, design patterns hold some answers as to how to do this. Single-Responsibility Principle - A block of code should do one thing, do it only, and do it well. I would argue, this violates the Single Responsibility Principle because you have a unit of code the component that is keeping track of health, experience, level, attack, and defense This one component knows about, and controls a lot of stuff, with complex interdependencies. A better way to write this system is break out the necessary components across various smaller components, called by some higher level component on the same game object - you would have a Health System, Attack System, Defense System, and Level System all called by the Character System. The Level System would be able to track XP gains, and level up events. On level up events, it would notify the other systems that they need to naturally improve, which each one would know how to do. The benefit of doing this is a particular unit of code contains less code for you to keep track of at any time. The relationships are simplified. You can have a firm knowledge of what a particular unit of code is doing at any given time. This is maintainable code. Open-Close Principle - Well-built code requires minimal changes in the face of new use cases. Now, the way you can solve this is simply to loop through each character of the string and see if a has been opened if so, increment a counter , see if a comes after a if so, decrement the counter , and test to see if a is dangling. The better thing to do would be to assign some default parameters to your original function that let it deal with a different set of conditions that follow the same rules [] is balanced;][] is not. Liskov Substitution Principle - Academically, the wording is awful, but pretty much, if you have two classes that have a common base class, both classes should be able to be handled as if they are an object of said base class. So, in programming, an interface has less to do with a GUI used to collect user input, and display some output, but more of a contract between a class that implements the contract, and the clients that consume this class. That means, Lists follow the same rules as an Enumerable collection. The difference is, Lists provide very specific functionality for a list of objects; enumerable collections just say, this is a collection of stuff that you can do sequential operations on. Sure individual implementations will vary, but you have the advantage of knowing when and where those are. I hope this helps you to figure out what parts of your code need improvement to be better maintainable.

6: Qualia, Unity, and Complexity - Neuroscience of Consciousness

Qualia, Unity, and Complexity It is very difficult to complete multiple tasks at one time because of the evolutionary adaptation to complete motor actions and plans fully without being interrupted. Neural activity as measured and understood by the scientific observer does not have the same qualities as the experience itself.

7: complexity of hierarchy affects performance? - Unity Answers

This paper discusses two main features of flavour perception, namely its unity and complexity occurring at different levels of our cognitive system - multimodal phenomenal experience and underlying information processing.

8: Unity Calendar | Unity

Unity ID. A Unity ID allows you to buy and/or subscribe to Unity products and services, shop in the Asset Store and participate in the Unity community.

9: Moving an object in 3D Space ~ Complexity - Unity Answers

If the widely acknowledged efficacy of PA for unilateral spatial neglect is accepted, and these conditions are found to have common pathophysiological mechanisms, then beyond the clinical complexity is a unity of therapeutic and physiological mechanisms, thereby, calling for a reappraisal of the common aspects of dissociable manifestations.

Is there a future for Islamic revolutions? How to get the hair you really want Itty Bitty Florals-Pretties A blind date with God : Richard Stearns Under the tower of Babel Asthma Diana Grootendorst Cara menghapus halaman The 100 Series Timed Math Tests, Addition and Subtraction True to the Old Flag Project management quick reference guide for project 2010 I.Q. goes to the library Gk publications gate cse The New York Quarterly, Number 3 A verdant paradise and a blond horizontal Essential grammar in use elementary 3rd edition Case files obgyn 4th Principles of microbiology gm atlas Spark Notes The Hobbit Quantitative books Courageous faith-bold witness Philip Temples South Island of New Zealand. The handbook of visual analysis Cape Breton book of the dead The water-route to the heart of Africa. Stewart multivariable calculus early transcendentals 8th edition Interpretation of an EKG strip Ding dong merrily on high piano sheet music Inst Smpplr-2hbj Te-Math Ele Tc Clothed in Integrity XI.THE PARIA PLATEAU AND THE MARBLE CANON PLATFORM199 October 1, 1904, 6:30 p.m. : Clifton Railroad Station Student Practice Tests All for your delight Mann, T. Introduction to Demian. Why do people sometimes look as if they are in pain at or near orgasm? Trees Shrubs (Gardening Landscaping) Imperial glass encyclopedia 4. Number of Weapons 32 Brazos introduction to Christian spirituality Neurophysiology: pelvic visceral function J. Thomas Benson