

Re: Marriage is under fire!!

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.basics/2004-08/0831.html>

From: andy (news4_at_earthsong.free-online.co.uk)

Date: 08/15/04

Date: Sun, 15 Aug 2004 22:06:57 +0100

On Sat, 14 Aug 2004 13:49:55 +0000, Kevin Aylward wrote:

> andy wrote:

>> On Sat, 14 Aug 2004 06:38:45 +0000, Kevin Aylward wrote:

>>

>>> John Larkin wrote:

>>>> On Fri, 13 Aug 2004 06:38:27 GMT, "Kevin Aylward"

>>>> <salesEXTRACT@anasoft.co.uk> wrote:

>>>> And then spend the rest of their lives

>>>> in analysis themselves. I had a good friend who did all this. She

>>>> said that Freudian analysis was mostly crap, except that once in a

>>>> while she got a patient that it **really** worked for.

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> Oh dear, so a one off that "works" is proof that it works? Like if I

>>>> say I can use ESP, to predict a dice throw, and once in a while I

>>>> get it right, so that proves the ESP?

>>>>

>>>> If you have a batch of unmarked transistors, and try to use the ebers

>>>> moll equation to build circuits with them, and find it works for a

>>>> few and not the rest, then one possible explanation is that a few are

>>>> bipolar transistors, and the rest are mosfets. Just pointing out that

>>>> you're jumping to conclusions as well.

>>>>

>>>> My conclusion was that the fact that it worked does not constitute proof

>>>> that the method was correct. This is still the case. Its irrelevant

>>>> whether or not the claim might turn out to be true. So, no, I am not

>>>> jumping to conclusions. My logic is correct.

I think you're slightly reinventing the logic after my post. The point of your post as far as I can see was to discredit the idea that it makes any sense to say a given method of therapy works for some people and not others. I posted an analogy to show why this might be incorrect (the point of the analogy being that in the case of the bipolar transistors, the person building the circuits would see a clear agreement with the model which they could verify, whereas with the mosfets it would just not work). My guess is that maybe the Freudian approach might be more

sci.electronics.basics: Re: Marriage is under fire!!

effective with people who are inclined to intellectualise their problems, and not with people who are more down to earth. So it could be that for such people, the therapist would see the model clearly working in the same sort of way as my analogy, whereas for other people it wouldn't, and they would think – ok, that's not working, I'll try something else.

--

<http://www.niftybits.ukfsn.org/>

remove 'n-u-l-l' to email me. html mail or attachments will go in the spam bin unless notified with [html] or [attachment] in the subject line.