

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-03/6086.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 03/17/05

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 2005 19:37:18 GMT

On Thu, 17 Mar 2005 12:34:01 -0500, "robert j. kolker"
<nowhere@nowhere.net> in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>*Daryl McCullough wrote:*

>

>>

>> *It's really a totalitarian mindset, not free-thinking.*

>

>*They use an operational definition. It goes "If I (the crack point)
>cannot understand something, it makes (or ought to make) no sense to
>anyone else". It is the elevation of ignorance and stupidity to a virtue.*

Yes, yes, I've noticed a distinctly well defined bijection between
ignorance, stupidity, and modern mathematicians. Tell us more.

>*The interesting thing is that mathematics which was conceived of very
>abstractly and with no physical or practical application in mind, has
>been drafted into the service of physics, and other sciences with good
>and useful results. For example, without the concept of probability
>(invented initially to calculate odds in card games) there would be no
>quantum theory as we know it. Without Riemannian geometry which was
>conceived to see how far Gauss' notions of intrinsic geometrical
>properties could be carried, there would be no General Theory of
>Relativity and no GPS. Without boolean algebra which was an
>algebrization of Aristotle's logic we would be hard put to design
>complicated computer components. And so on and so on. Anything no
>forbidden by inconsistency is permitted.*

More slogans and handwaving. I thought all this was the result of
hermit operators and Hilbert crawl spaces. Better get your story
straight before you run it up a flagpole, Bob.

Regards – Lester