

## Re: Philosophy of Science.

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-07/2155.html>

---

**From:** Albert (*alwagner\_at\_tcac.net*)

**Date:** 07/11/04

Date: Sun, 11 Jul 2004 09:50:23 -0500

On Sun, 11 Jul 2004 07:29:03 GMT

"Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote:

>  
> "Albert" <alwagner@tcac.net> wrote in message  
> news:20040710211958.049e0198@lfs.mydomain.com...  
>> On Sun, 11 Jul 2004 00:37:28 GMT  
>> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote:  
>>  
>>>  
>>> "Albert" <alwagner@tcac.net> wrote in message  
>>> news:20040710102714.69e5c118@lfs.mydomain.com...  
>>>> On Sat, 10 Jul 2004 06:10:22 GMT  
>>>> "Bill Hobba" <bhobba@rubbish.net.au> wrote:  
>>>> <snip>  
>>>>> Someone who called scientific activity 'mind games' is  
>>>>> in no position to accuse others of straw man arguments.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> On the contrary. Recognition of a straw man requires  
>>>>> nothing more than knowing the definition of a straw man  
>>>>> and recognizing when someone else is erroneously  
>>>>> characterizing your position.  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Read my previous posts for comprehension: If the term  
>>>>> 'mind games' offends you then use 'gedanken experiments.'  
>>>>  
>>>> What offends me is describing what Einstein did in the  
>>>> totally non standard and vague terminology of 'mind games'.  
>>>>  
>>>> I wasn't aware of a "standard terminology" for use in  
>>>> discussing Einstein. Nor do I consider the term 'mind games'  
>>>> vague.  
>>>>  
>>>> The only  
>>>> purpose of such is to confuse the issue by suggesting it  
>>>> really had no physical content.  
>>>>  
>>>> I don't know what that statement means. I don't know about

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Philosophy of Science.

> > *'issues' that have no physical content. The only 'issues'*  
> > *that I am aware of contain grammar and semantic content.*  
>  
> *You seem to know very little yet wish to suggest a lot. As Bob*  
> *says: 'Your motives and style appear to be snide. A real*  
> *smart--ass ye arrrrre.'. Wake up to yourself.*

This is just a thinly veiled ad hominem attack because you are  
unable to justify your previous posts.

<snip>

--

"Today there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the  
physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the  
stream of knowledge is heading towards a non-mechanical reality;  
the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a  
great machine. Mind no longer appears to be an accidental  
intruder into the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect  
that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of  
the realm of matter"

--Sir James Jeans