

Re: You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-01/3211.html>

From: Androcles (*dummy_at_dummy.net*)

Date: 01/16/05

Date: Sun, 16 Jan 2005 20:50:54 GMT

<reany@asu.edu> wrote in message
news:1105908328.900851.41560@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...
>
> *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.*
>> >>

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

>> >> *Tell ya what.*
>> >>
>> >> *If you OBSERVE some phemonenon you do not understand,*
>> >> *come and talk to me about it, we'll try to figure it out.*
>> >
>> > *I don't understand the phemonenon 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*

Re: You do not logical deduce hypotheses of physical causes

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

>> *of Harry Potter's wand makes the magic work.*

>

> *Why should I?*

Exactly. It would be idle speculation.

Androcles.