

# Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/0192.html>

---

**From:** Albert (*albertwagner\_at\_cox.net*)

**Date:** 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 15:21:45 -0600

Lester Zick wrote:

<snip>

> So is adding "degree angle" to 60 but I've never seen reference to a  
> 60 although there are references to 30-60-90 triangles where the ratio  
> of angles is being described. And, by the way, radians may be the  
> preferred measure but they are no more natural than degrees in  
> describing arcs because you need the radius as reference whereas  
> degrees only requires the circle itself as reference. (I know you're  
> going to disagree; so you're welcome to the last word here as far as  
> I'm concerned because the whole discussion reminds me of whether  
> electric current is positive or negative. At the academy we used  
> positive hole flow instead of electron flow for current direction for  
> some reason that always escaped me.)

In Nuclear Power School, one class used hole flow and another used electron flow. Apparently, it made no difference to the equipment.

<snip>

--

"Mercifully free of the ravages of intelligence"

-- Time Bandits