

Re: Baghdad

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-05/msg01589.html>

- *From:* Harlan Messinger <hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 26 May 2008 19:38:27 -0400
-

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

On May 26, 9:09 pm, Harlan Messinger
<hmessinger.removethis@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Franz Gnaedinger wrote:

If I made things up you could easily falsify my
reconstructions. But you can't,

That doesn't make them true. Why isn't that obvious to you?

Last week I read an article on Karl Poppers
criterium of scientific falsibility. The author
says there are many physical theories that
can't be falsified, and yet they are truly
scientific,

Then you should stop reading Karl Poppers, whoever he is.

while Newton's physical theory
was falsified a long time ago but is still
in use.

It wasn't falsified, it was shown to be incomplete, and it's as close to perfect as it needs to be for use for most
mundane purposes.

Falsifying isn't really the way how
the sciences proceed.

Of course it is. Nothing that can't be tested is accepted as a scientific conclusion.

Re: Baghdad

What actually happens

is that scientists are gathering evidence in favor of their idea or hypothesis or theory,

Whereas you make up stuff in your head, and you associate unrelated things and imagine that they are related.