

# Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-09/msg00468.html>

---

- *From:* "g" <[gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 22 Sep 2005 17:25:08 -0400 (EDT)
- 

"John Edser" <[edser@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:edser@xxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:dgst1c\\$t88\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dgst1c$t88$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>  
>  
> JE:–  
> When the scientific method is correctly and EMPIRICALLY applied no "level  
> of  
> judgment" is required to test a theory to refutation, just a little  
> THOUGHT.  
>  
> Regards,  
>  
> John Edser  
> Independent Researcher

John,

You give me so much to think about that it will take me some time. Now that you have brought the language down to a level I can process, you still pose (it seems to me) some deductions that I am unable to bridge between some of them.

You are very kind and patient to allow me room to catch up.

Do let me say, however, that I discern something of the nature of "political" polarizations among some of the contributors to sbe. Some impress me to desire to argue things on the basis of quoting someone who wrote a statement merely reiterating their stance on something.

When someone does that, he does not present the argument, just finds a quote that restates it (or sometimes strikes me as being unrelated to any argument on it).

If I ask a person to explain something with non-LOADED words... as I did you... and you respond thoughtfully and courteously, then I am motivated to continue to try to follow their facts and reasoning by asking further questions.

Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

When, on the other hand, I get a personal attack — for example the person accuses me of being unintelligent — that, to me, suggests they either are not secure in the argument fully stated, or that they are not really sure of their argument, or that they have an emotional problem that corrupts their ability to communicate, or that they simply are arrogant and egotistical.

Now, if they just don't have TIME, and tell me that, I reserve all judgement and accept it. Having worked FOR DECADES on jobs requiring seventy to eighty hour work weeks, I am well acquainted with not having time to explain something fully.

Please continue to be patient with me as I try to figure out questions aimed at asking you to fill a gap that I experience in trying to follow some of the things you say. I TOTALLY understand if you have thought something through so long ago that you no longer feel the need to connect every dot.

At my end, I sometimes encounter gaps in somebody's explanation of something and do not even know quite how to ask about what lies between.

For sake of avoiding inundating you with questions, and some poorly worded, let me just ask you something now and then as the spirit moves.

Thank you, again, for your courtesy and patience,

g  
>  
> edser@xxxxxxxxxxx  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

.

---

• **References:**

◆ **Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE**

◇ *From:* John Edser

- Prev by Date: **Re: A fully developed creature can evolve?**
- Next by Date: **Re: Most important paper in evolutionary biology**
- Previous by thread: **Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE**
- Next by thread: **Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**