

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/4317.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 03/13/05

Date: Sun, 13 Mar 2005 17:43:26 GMT

On Sat, 12 Mar 2005 21:52:40 -0500, "robert j. kolker"
<nowhere@nowhere.net> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>
>
>Albert Wagner wrote:
>
>>
>> I would also appreciate an agreement on just what QM consists of.
>
>
>For a brief definition of quantum theory see:
>
>See <http://www.answers.com/topic/quantum-theory>
>
>> I have noticed that you and others have quietly and surrepticiously
>> appropriated much of classical physics into QM and thereby mislead the
>> public as to just what QM is.
>
>Do not coflate your confusion and ignorance with being misled. Your
>problem is that you do not know too much about physics.
>
>? I suspect that many of the benefits that
>> you attribute to QM are in fact more properly attributed to classical
>> physics.
>
>You are quite mistaken. Quantum physics is postively necessary to
>describe and predict large classes of phenomena.

Quantum mechanics is necessary. Quantum postulates are not a mechanics.

>> And by classical I don't mean something that stopped being
>> developed with Newton. By classical physics I mean physics updated with
>> all to date experiments,
>
>Classical mechanics cannot account for many phenomena. Kinetic molecular
>theory based on classical principles does not predict specific heats of

sci.math: Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

- >many substances correctly, for example. Classical radiation theory does
- >not describe black body radiation. In fact quantum theory started with
- >Planck's description of black