

# Re: Things Formulaic

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-05/msg01699.html>

---

- *From:* Mark Ferguson <nunya@xxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 12 May 2005 12:57:57 -0700
- 

Al wrote:

<I'll reply to the below because you don't seem to know how to direct and format replies appropriately to newsgroups; it'll come eventually. I'll even show you how it might look>

There seems to be a misunderstanding. I do not think that maths is bad; maths is neutral, its the use to which it's put that is bad. There is nothing wrong with science per se, its the ham fisted way it is used.

<The single indent means you wrote the immediately above text>

"Ham-fisted" usually indicates a lack of consideration of some factor(s). Which factor(s) did you have in mind?

When I speak of dehumanisation I mean the quantifying of us.

Look, whether you like it or not, people have characteristics which are quantizable (not that it's been done to the last decimal place yet) and thus subject to statistical modeling.

Psychology has decided to lick the ass/arse of science and reduced us all to statistical nonentities. ( This includes you also) The reason for this is because science has pointed the finger and accused psychology of having a murky past. This is only true in a scientific sense.

Yep, and what other "sense" is worth considering?

"Mathematics is used to quantize the elements of problems in order to make predictions about previously-unseen combinations of those elements;

## Re: Things Formulaic

<The double indent means I wrote the immediately above text; your newsreader program may display things a bit differently>

"Making 'predictions'" is the operative word Mark.

Yep, it sure is. Previous versions of psychology have failed utterly precisely because they used "murky" methodologies. Do you have a problem with your behaviors being made predictable? Do you actually believe that "predictable" in this case means "inhuman"? It doesn't, you know. Psychology will simply never be able to reduce individual human behavior to the same level of predictability Physics has for individual fundamental particles for reasons that ought to be blatantly obvious to you; that people's minds have many, many more "quantum states" available to them than do say hadrons, and can transition between them without warning not to mention existing in two or more of them simultaneously. Nor is the word "stable" applicable to humans except in the context of a given sociopolitical venue.

However, it's fairly easy to observe which state(s) is/are predominant in a given population sample at a given time and tailor inputs to get a given response; ask any rabble-rousing politician.

See, I predicted (but didn't mention) that you'd have the precise reaction you've exhibited because you're actually a wannabe Mystic who thinks that there's some ineffable aspect to humans that separates them from "Physical reality". That mindset comes from a very shallow understanding of what "Physical reality" means.

"You seem to  
have a serious bug up your ass about "higher  
mathematics" being a tool used to exclude those who don't understand  
any of it from being taken seriously when discussing subjects where  
it's applicable".

Absolutely. It's used to pull the wool over the eyes.

Horseshit. Learn the math used, and then challenge the discussions. You consistently use hostile terminology when talking about math; did you run up against some personal ability to absorb it? Get over it; I got stuck at Beginning Calculus, but have managed to slowly slog my way deep enough into it to be able to differentiate (pardon the pun) between real results and handwaving bullshit.

I'm talking about the consequences of telling lies to the public and

## Re: Things Formulaic

bullshit maths when the poor 'masses' hang on every word that science utters.

How about the purely emotion-based lies told daily by politicians, aimed specifically at those on the low end of the bell curve? Are those OK with you?

Have a look at what Michael Crichton( Well known sci fi writer)  
[http://www.crichton-official.com/speeches/speeches\\_quote04.html](http://www.crichton-official.com/speeches/speeches_quote04.html) ) has to say about his early faith in science and how he became disillusioned. I feel just the same.

And... Crichton is your hero because he's finally come out as a neoLuddite? Surprise, he always was.

Mark L. Fegrerson