

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/0346.html>

From: Albert (*albertwagner_at_cox.net*)

Date: 02/28/05

Date: Mon, 28 Feb 2005 15:21:45 -0600

Lester Zick wrote:

<snip>

> So is adding "degree angle" to 60 but I've never seen reference to a
> 60 although there are references to 30-60-90 triangles where the ratio
> of angles is being described. And, by the way, radians may be the
> preferred measure but they are no more natural than degrees in
> describing arcs because you need the radius as reference whereas
> degrees only requires the circle itself as reference. (I know you're
> going to disagree; so you're welcome to the last word here as far as
> I'm concerned because the whole discussion reminds me of whether
> electric current is positive or negative. At the academy we used
> positive hole flow instead of electron flow for current direction for
> some reason that always escaped me.)

In Nuclear Power School, one class used hole flow and another used electron flow. Apparently, it made no difference to the equipment.

<snip>

--

"Mercifully free of the ravages of intelligence"
-- Time Bandits