

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2005-03/1091.html>

From: AllYou! (*idaman_at_conversent.net*)

Date: 03/04/05

Date: Fri, 4 Mar 2005 14:29:47 -0500

<reany@asu.edu> wrote in message
news:1109963170.332596.238700@o13g2000cwo.googlegroups.com...
>
> *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.

You don't even know what it is, much less be able to express it consistently.

>

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

- > > *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*
- > > *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.*

LOL! I just love it when you're cornered. you always come out with something stupid like this. If you had an answer, you'd give me a reasoned explanation as to how you can freely associate the light wave frequency which you always associated with the concept of red, with that of blue. to do the free association in the way that you suggest would mean that any time you got bored with the color of your house, you wouldn't have to paint it, you could just see it as a different color.

But you can't make that argument because you know it makes no sense. You know that when you see your car, you will see it the same color today as you did yesterday. you know that you have no choice in the matter. You know that you're forced to match the light frequency which it reflects with the same color concept that you matched it with yesterday.

- .> 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."*

There you go, inventing your own definitions again. you do that quite frequently when you're cornered. Instead of admitting that you're wrong, you just freely invent new definitions. What a concept!

- > *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.*

You don't even know what you just typed! At least now you're admitting that there is a forced mapping, which I've been telling you all along is known as observation. First of all, you deny that there's any such thing as stimulus, yet you refer to the existence of an external world. Without stimuli, what is the link between the internal and external worlds?

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

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

>

> [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?*

Those are silly questions.

If I can predict a quantity of force will result from the deceleration of a rock as it contacts my head, I can avoid it if it's too great. If I can predict the length of a day, I can plan a hunting trip. If I can predict the length of a season, I can plant food. If I can predict the force with which a rock of a given mass will strike an object as it falls from a given distance, I can sit in a tree at a sufficient height with a rock of sufficient mass so as to kill an animal as it passes below.

Also, there is no value to naked curiosity beyond the first two purposes I gave.