

# You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-01/3209.html>

---

*reany\_at\_asu.edu*

**Date:** 01/16/05

Date: 16 Jan 2005 12:45:28 -0800

Androcles wrote:

> <reany@asu.edu> wrote in message  
> news:1105889348.242434.42100@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...  
>>  
>> Androcles wrote:  
>>> <reany@asu.edu> wrote in message  
>>> news:1105846187.721920.196850@f14g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...  
>>>>  
>>>> Androcles wrote:  
>>>>> <reany@asu.edu> wrote in message  
>>>>> news:1105819627.457138.33760@c13g2000cwb.googlegroups.com...  
>>>>>>  
>>>>> [snip]  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> That is my point.  
>>>>>> Physics, as with any science, begins with observation,  
>>>>>> investigates (experiments if you like) and explains the  
>>>>> observation.  
>>>>>> Idle speculation about what might be isn't physics at all,  
it  
>>>> isn't  
>>>>>> even science.  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> How does one distinguish idle from non-idle speculation?  
>>>>>>  
>>>>>> At it again, Reany? Always with the idle questions you  
>>>>>> can figure out the answer to for yourself, if you only tried.  
>>>>>> Androcles.  
>>>> You're the one who introduced the term, not me. Hypocrite.  
>>>>>  
>>> You really are as thick as two short planks, Reany.  
>>>>  
>>> Tell ya what.  
>>>>  
>>> If you OBSERVE some phemonenon you do not understand,

sci.physics.relativity: You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes

- > >> *come and talk to me about it, we'll try to figure it out.*
- > >
- > > *I don't understand the phenomenon of inveterate ignorance of people*
  
- > > *who*
- > > *should know better, like you and Bilge. But let's not even go there.*
- > >
- > *Since you raised the issue, inveterate ignorance is all yours.*

I admitted to ignorance! I am ignorant of the rule you use. Tell us the rule!

- >
- > >>
- > >> *If you IMAGINE some phenomenon you do not understand,*
- > >> *take it elsewhere, I'm not interested in your imagination.*
- > >
- > > *But I am very interested in your reasoning processes!*
- >
- > *It is called "logical deduction". We see something and try to*
- > *explain it.*

Try to explain it in terms of what, though? Hypotheses? You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes!

Science education is lousy!

- > *AllYou! IMAGINED something and tried explain it.*
- > *You IMAGINE I'm ignorant and seek to explain it.*
- > *I KNOW you are, and accept it as it is.*
- >
- > > *In science,*
- > > *things have to be justified, not just proclaimed.*
- >
- > *Only if they are observations.*
- > *I don't have to justify anything imagined by others*

Are you saying that the physical content of physics is restricted to those things that can be "observed" by humans?

- >
- >
- > *And everything is on*
- > > *the table of inspection.*
- >
- > *Ok, then justify how a unicorn hair through the core*
- > *of Harry Potter's wand makes the magic work.*

Why should I? What's the relevance to this discussion? There is a huge gap between rocks and unicorns. It's the rules for identifying the

You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes

sci.physics.relativity: You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes

in-between cases that you seem to be so sure of and which I want you to clue the rest of us in on. Since I haven't seen a magic wand, what relevance does it have to the discussion?

>

> >> *Does that delineate idle from non-idle speculation for you?*

> >> *Arsehole.*

> >

> > *No.*

>

> *Didn't think it would.*

Citing special cases is not the same as providing a rule, Nitwit.

>

>

> > *How does one know when one "understands a phenomenon," if*

> > *understanding is not uniquely determined by the phenomenon itself?*

> > *Where does understanding of a phenomenon reside?*

>

>

> *Ask Harry Potter.*

Maybe, if he posts here. Let me know. Is he smarter than you? Woops. Silly question! That goes without saying! Probably nicer too. Oh well, Newsgroups.

Patrick