

Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-03/9441.html>

From: Lester Zick (lesterDELzick_at_worldnet.att.net)

Date: 03/17/05

Date: Thu, 17 Mar 2005 19:32:44 GMT

On 17 Mar 2005 09:07:47 -0800, stevendary13016@yahoo.com (Daryl McCullough) in comp.ai.philosophy wrote:

>You know, there is a romantic notion of the brave, free-thinking
>iconoclast being repressed by the closed-minded establishment.
>You might think that the uncensored nature of USENET would be
>a perfect forum for such free-thinkers. But in my experience, the
>"dissidents" (AKA "crackpots") on USENET are not complaining about
>how *closed-minded* the establishment is, but how *open-minded*.

So, Daryl, is this set of crackpots countably uncountable? Is there a well defined bijection between the set of all facts and the set of all true facts? And is there a well defined bijection between the set of all mathematicians and the set of all points that mathematicians claim define a circle but really define a sphere? I'm not so sure truth is as romantic as it is universal. But I am sure it has no well defined bijection with modern mathematicians.

>Their complaints are about how nonsensical relativity, or quantum
>mechanics, or Cantorian set theory, or Godel's theory is. What these
>dissidents want is not a hearing for their *new* ideas (because they
>rarely have any), but for other ideas to be banished.

I'm less interested in hearing than true lies about ideas and science.

>It's really a totalitarian mindset, not free-thinking.

Whereas the mathematician mindset is more free wheeling than universal.

Regards - Lester