

Re: Baghdad

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-05/msg01628.html>

- *From:* Franz Gnaedinger <frgn@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 27 May 2008 06:56:22 -0700 (PDT)
-

On May 27, 1:27 pm, Harlan Messinger
<hmessinger.removet...@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Nonsense. It is entirely possible for a discovery to be made that is inconsistent with either of them and that would therefore invalidate them. (I assume you mean "string theory" rather than "spring theory".)

Yes, of course, string theory (but hey, spring theory sounds nice, what if the strings are actually tiny springs?). If a hypothesis resembles a piece of wood, a theory resembles a furniture consisting of several pieces of wood that were put together. A hypothesis can be falsified entirely, while a theory such as the string theories or M-theory can partly be falsified: it is already partly established, as a fecund theory that introduced a plethora of new mathematical tools, and as way of thinking real big, which was adopted by the many alternatives, for example loop theory.

The world is much more simple than we ever can imagine, and much more complex than we ever can imagine, Goethe said.

Goethe's musings have no bearing on anything.

Sorry, but for me Goethe is more important than your replies are. The basic idea of his wonderful metamorphosis of the plants has been confirmed by modern biology (see: Stephen Jay Gould, *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*, chapter on deep homology). Goethe said the world is more than ten thousand years old, when everybody assumed it was much younger,

Re: Baghdad

and while string theorists are still looking out for a world formula that can be written on a T-shirt, Goethe provided a world formula that can be written on the palm of a hand: All is equal, all unequal ...

I hope for world peace. I hope you can see the distinction between my hoping for it and its actual occurrence. I hope you'll understand the difference between your hopes and reality but I don't see that hope being realized any time soon either.

I hope for world peace too, and my contribution is a fair history of civilization. A lot of work, and gets me covered with a lot of dirt.

They are rigorously deduced or at least rigorously induced. If you don't comprehend the difference between inventing, hoping, and rigorous deduction and induction, then of course this conversation is never going to go anywhere.

The question whether mathematical theorems are discovered or constructed is a big problem in the philosophy of mathematics. You can by no means get around it by a couple of such lines. What you call rigorous always is rigorous for the time being, no longer for a later time that will produce new standards of rigorosity, and the question always remains: why is it that a couple of signs can contain and reveal so much reality? If you don't wonder about this, you are no productive scientist. All real scientists did wonder: Goethe, Einstein, Feynman ...

I don't care what Karl Popper said.

And you don't care about Goethe, and you don't care about Göbekli Tepe ...

Connecting them via convincing evidence and deductive reasoning, not via hope and poetry and humming in a dark room.

Read how Andrew Wilson described his working

Re: Baghdad

Re: Baghdad

process: it is like stumbling around in the dark and bumping into furniture, till, after a couple of months, you learned where the furniture stands and you find the light switch and turn it on, then you get into the next room and the same happens again, you stumble around in the dark and bump into furniture ... The basic process of finding new insights does never begin by deductive reasoning, it is a stumbling around in the dark, and, yes, probably accompanied by a lot of humming.