

Re: You say that science is not about truth, meaning, knowledge, or faith

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-03/1081.html>

reany_at_asu.edu

Date: 03/04/05

Date: 4 Mar 2005 11:06:10 -0800

AllYou! wrote:

> <*reany@asu.edu*> wrote in message

[snip]

> > > *According to you, the existence of anything is a free invention of the human mind, and people consist of matter, as do measuring instruments.*

> >

> > *That is totally wrong!!! I define my "internal world" as the set of my*

> > *mental concepts and all my thoughts. I define the "external world" as*

> > *all else. I believe, contrary to what Weston constantly lies about me,*

> > *that there exists an external world independent of my thoughts (my internal world). However, the internal world of concepts, which I use*

> > *to model or describe what may or may not be in the external world (which is unknowable), are freely invented: that is, my internal world*

> > *is NOT forced on me by the external world, even though I admit that*

> > *there seems to be strong natural tendencies on how this "mapping"*

> > *between them occurs. That is, I believe, a little part of what*

Einstein

> > *meant by "persistent illusion."*

>

> *You're starting to come around, but you're not quite there yet.*

I haven't changed my opinion on the internal-external world distinction in 20 years.

> *Your internal world has*

> *sub-categories as well. While you are free to develop any concept you wish, you are not*

> *free to associate any stimuli with any concept. IOW, whatever concept you've developed*

sci.physics.relativity: Re: You say that science is not about truth, meaning, knowledge, or faith

- > *for the notion of red was developed in your mind. How freely this was invented by you is*
- > *debatable, but not by me at this time. Anyway, whenever your eyes are stimulated by the*
- > *light frequency which you've always associated with the concept of red, you will associate*
- > *it with that concept again if all else remains the same. You have no choice in the*
- > *matter.*

Prove it.

Besides that, I already told that there are two distinct meanings to "free." One meaning is the use of choice; the other meaning is "no logical connection between the external and internal worlds." What the latter means, is that, even if there is some forced mapping on us between the internal and external worlds, it isn't a function of the structure or essence of the external world itself, nor does it arise from within it. Who knows what it would be? I don't claim to know or even guess.

[snip]

- > > *The purpose of this 'model' of yours is what?*
- >
- > *As to the purpose, primarily it's survival, secondarily, a more*
- > *comfortable experience, thirdly, curiosity.*

How is this scientific model used for survival? And what is the curiosity value of it?

Patrick