

Re: Eric Gisse has no any diploma

Re: Eric Gisse has no any diploma

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics.relativity/2008-02/msg01339.html>

- *From:* PD <TheDraperFamily@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 14 Feb 2008 17:21:27 -0800 (PST)
-

On Feb 14, 5:32 pm, xxein <xx...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 14, 3:05 pm, PD <TheDraperFam...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Feb 13, 7:37 pm, xxein <xx...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

xxein: You don't need a diploma to do the physic. All you need is a logic.

I know you'd like to think so. That is the hope of many an amateur on this group. It is unfortunately not true. It isn't true for plumbing, it isn't true for cardiac surgery, it isn't true for the practice of law, and it isn't true for physics. I haven't got the foggiest idea why you would think physics would be different.

xxein: So logic is not needed?

Yes, it is needed. It is not sufficient. Therein lies the problem.

Or it is a separate logic for plumbing etc? I can grant the division of logic for/to sub-categories. That is not the issue.

The issue is whether we can have more than one logic that we use to understand this universe. I think you will agree that there cannot be more than one logic that works through the entirety. It is manifested by the universe, itself, if it has any consistant laws at all.

My statement of logic follows those laws and not a generalised logic that allows you to hammer a nail.

Re: Eric Gisse has no any diploma

Re: Eric Gisse has no any diploma

Did I express this correctly, now?