

Re: Regroup.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2004-12/3607.html>

From: AllYou! (*idaman_at_conversent.net*)

Date: 12/08/04

Date: Wed, 8 Dec 2004 14:19:49 -0500

<reany@asu.edu> wrote in message
news:1102531698.169414.93880@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...
>
> *AllYou!* wrote:
>> <reany@asu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:1102456434.436977.148030@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...
>
> [snip]
>>> *What do you mean by material? I'm not asking *who* gets to
> decide if
>>> something fits the
>>> definition, if asking what your definition is?*
>>>
>>> *Material is whatever convention claims it is at any moment.*
>
> *This is a complete and valid definition, since I'm interested for the
> moment only in the logical relationships among these terms.*

That's clearly a non-answer. You used the term in reply to a more substantive question regarding your views on the notion of physicality. Your answer to that relied upon this term and so you must have your own thoughts as to what *you* mean by it. This is obfuscation at its best.

>
>>>
>>>>
>>>> *And what is a measurement?*
>>>
>>>> *A measurement is the assignment of a number to an event pair by a
>>>> freely invented rule.*
>>>
>>>> *I know what I mean by a measurement and how valid it is
>>>> because my definition of what's physical,*
>>>
>>>> *Great! Define measurement for us all.*
>
> *Why didn't you define measurement?*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: Regroup.

You are the one who uses this term as the basis for explaining your views on physicality and so *you* must have an idea what it means. So how do *you* define what it means to measure?

> > *I accept, for the sake of argument if not more substantively than
> that, your position that
> > everything is an abstraction and a free invention of the human mind.
>
> Let's get it right: Everything in a theory is an abstraction and a free
> invention of the human mind. I do NOT claim that "everything is an
> abstraction."*

Theories are not containers and as such, nothing is *in* them. So what do you mean by *Everything in a theory*? do you mean every theory or every perception of what's described in a theory or something else?

> > *I cannot, not do I
> > even choose, to try to prove that I know what I know about anything.
> For all I know, I'm
> > like the character in the Matrix where a reality is being pumped into
> my brain and none of
> > what I think is real is real. For all I know, I'm imagining
> everything of what I
> > perceive. I've got that, I understand that, and I also understand
> that everything I think
> > is a free invention of my mind. I'll even go so far as to stipulate
> to the notion that
> > even that which I sense is a free invention of the mind. Please
> re-read all of that so
> > that we're clear on this point.
>
> I don't go that far. I am willing to believe that there is some
> "natural" sensation in the brain that results from stimuli, and that we
> are then free to formulate freely concepts, precepts, and theories to
> rationalize those concepts and precepts.*

Good. But what do you mean by free? Must we use certain commonly accepted rules dictated by logic and reasoning or are we free to formulate these despite that?

> > *I'll now assume, at great peril to this post, that you understand
> what I just said and
> > that you won't quibble about it.
>
> I knew that we could finally reach a common ground!*

Only because you cannot be trusted to be intellectually honest. I know we agree on that as well.

[snip]

> *post drivel which quibbles with much of it, but so be it. Now, to*
> *move forward, that part*
> > *that you don't get is that as a free invention, as an anarchist to*
> *science, I've banded*
> > *together with other anarchists to accept a set of narrow rules in*
> *order to facilitate a*
> > *curiosity I have.*

[snip]

> > *Although I do not assert anything as fact, for the sake of exploring*
> > *that which we believe, we've freely created a set of rules to explore*
> *that which we*
> > *believe we sense.*

[snip]

> > *So, first I've decided to make the assumption, just for the sake of*
> *exploration, that what*
> > *I sense is consistent and operates to a set of rules I call Nature,*
> *and then I assume that*
> > *there are other people and that some of them sense what I sense.*
>
> *First you said that science is rules; now you say that Nature is rules.*

To go forward in science, I've assumed that what I sense operates by a set of rules and then we've created a set of rules by which we will proceed to explore those rules. Why is this so difficult for you? I assumed that you have a much larger intellectual capacity than what you display here. I guess I was wrong.

> > *Again, I claim nothing*
> > *about the reality of any of this. It's all just an assumption but*
> *one upon which I've*
> > *decided to proceed.*
> >
> > *Now, me and all of my imaginary friends, and that includes *everyone**
> *(I'll just stipulate*
> > *that when I speak of others, they are those who I imagine and assume*
> *exist) who is willing*
> > *to engage in the same pursuit.*

[snip]

> > *That even includes you.*

[snip]

> > *We call this set of rules*
> > *science, and we developed a sub-set of rules we call physics.*

[snip]

> > *Because those rules were*
> > *developed upon those two assumptions, then any discussion of them,*
> *and implementation of*
> > *them, is also based upon those two assumptions. IOW, I am free to*
> *invent anything in my*
> > *mind, and I've chosen to invent that perception of reality.*

[snip]

> > *So from here on in, whenever I discuss physics, I do so from that*
> *perspective and with*
> > *those who have done similarly. Included in that is the assumption*
> *that I have a*
> > *perception of receiving a whole host of sensory stimuli, and that*
> *there is a consistency*
> > *and predictability to all of it.*
> >
> > *Now, any further discussion with you on matters of physics must also*
> *include those basic*
> > *assumptions or we really have nothing more to discuss. It's fine to*
> *have discussions of*
> > *what those rules should be and where they've lead us, but if you*
> *ignore the assumptions,*
> > *then we've returned to pure fantasy and imagination and this is the*
> *wrong forum for any of*
> > *that.*
>
> *Even granting the existence of an objective world apart from human*
> *mind, there remains that truth to me that conceptions of what the world*
> *contains as "objects" and rules are not the same thing as the things*
> *and rules themselves, assuming that Nature has "rules."*
>
> *Assuming that Nature does have "rules," what is the relationship*
> *between Nature's rules and the laws of physics, if any?*

See the above.