

## Re: Marriage is under fire!!

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.basics/2004-08/0862.html>

---

**From:** Jonathan Kirwan ([jkirwan\\_at\\_easystreet.com](mailto:jkirwan_at_easystreet.com))

**Date:** 08/16/04

Date: Mon, 16 Aug 2004 21:54:35 GMT

On Mon, 16 Aug 2004 23:51:50 +0100, andy <[news4@earthsong.free-online.co.uk](mailto:news4@earthsong.free-online.co.uk)> wrote:

>There is a theoretical language, just not as complex as that used by  
>western medicine. I'd have to know more about it in depth to say whether  
>its predictions could be falsified in the way you're talking about. If  
>chinese medicine was wholly useless, I doubt that it would have lasted as  
>long as it has – it's not like things like people believing whether the  
>sun moved round the earth, which didn't make much practical difference to  
>their lives at the time.

If you read me closely, you'll see that I not only steered clear of saying that it was useless, in practice, but went out of my way to make it clear that I didn't intend such implications.

Knowing that the sun will rise tomorrow is useful, too. But it's not a theory of science. It's a deduction \*from\* imaginative and independent theory.

There lies the key. Being useful or practical says nothing about whether or not it's scientific.

>I don't have the energy to reply to the rest of this.

Understood. I apologize for writing too much.

Jon