

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/3470.html>

From: Lester Zick (*lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net*)

Date: 03/10/05

Date: Thu, 10 Mar 2005 16:12:30 GMT

On Thu, 10 Mar 2005 10:31:02 -0600, Albert Wagner
<albertwagner@cox.net> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>*robert j. kolker wrote:*

>>

>> *Albert Wagner wrote:*

>>

>>> *That's all a pretty pitiful defense of a Theory that is obviously on
>>> it last legs. Standard Theory is a Rube Goldberg contraption held
>>> together with chewing gum, paper clips and Faith.*

>>

>> *1. GTR has served and still serves us well. The GPS system is a
>> practical application.*

>

>*Newtonian physics also has served and still serves us well. Yet
>Newton had to posit a mysterious attractive force called
>'gravity'. The fact that bad theories can serve well for many
>phenomena is no justification for clinging blindly to the status quo.*

>

>> *2. The issue of matter not detected electromagnetically has not lead to
>> a flat out contradiction with experiment. At present it is an ad-hoc
>> hypothesis which may yet be redeemed. Work is being done in that directon.*

>

>*The same can be said for psychic phenomena.*

>

>> *3. There is no better theory of gravitation at hand, so whatever ad hoc
>> patches are required will be made.*

>

>*Yes, there is a better theory for gravity at hand. Standard
>Theory is *nothing but* ad hoc patches.*

>

>> *GTR may have a hole in it, but it is
>> not outright false, in the sameway the Newtonian gravitation is.*

>

>*You can't prove either one true or false. Both are pure fabrication.*

>

>> *What*

>> *would kill all the relativity theories and any theories based on them*

>> *dead as a doornail is faster than light transmission of information or*
>> *transport of matter. There is no cure for that. That is a theory killer.*
>
>*Yes. That would account for the frantic search for patches to*
>*bandage up 'entanglement'.*
>
>> *Even after the anomalous motion of Mercury was known (since about 1875)*
>> *Newtonian Gravitation was still used.*
>
>*There is no such thing as Newtonian Gravitation. There never was.*
> *An attractive force called gravitation was merely hypothesized*
> *and named by Newton. No such force has ever been empirically*
> *explained. When cornered, amateur physicists like you, invite*
> *you jump from a high building as proof that their theories are*
> *true, when all such jumping does is prove that bodies*
> *mysteriously grow closer together. But Neanderthals knew that much.*
>
>> *In fact several ad hoc explanations*
>> *for the anomalous precession of the perihelia were proposed. They were*
>> *never redeemed empirically. When a better theory of gravitation was*
>> *achieved without the ad hocary, Newtonian Gravitation was demoted from a*
>> *fundamental theory to a heuristic.*
>
>*Your 'better' theory is no closer than Newton was to explanation.*
>
>> *The same fate may yet befall GTR.*
>> *However, the matter is not settled yet. Further work on*
>> *super-symmetric-partner particles may yet resolve the matter(sic!)*
>
>*And wise scientists and laypersons are already questioning the*
> *endless proliferation of invented particles and forces for which*
> *no explanation can be given, other than: "It was needed to make*
> *the math work."*

You're really cooking with gas in this subthread, Albert. Good work.

Regards – Lester