

# Re: Mike Helland Reading List

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-03/msg01986.html>

---

- *From:* Michael Helland <mobydikc@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Wed, 26 Mar 2008 17:26:06 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mar 26, 5:08 pm, theman <genericjoe2...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Mar 26, 7:25 pm, Michael Helland <mobyd...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:  
<snip>

So I understand algebra.

And from there I suppose I grok equations.

And you'd be wrong, since algebra is one small area of math, and not a comprehensive idea of mathematics...

Equations are one small area of mathematics, and not a comprehensive idea of mathematics.

That's the irony.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conjecture>

I suggest you read up...

I suggest you read that webpage.

Did you make it to the second paragraph?

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

It says:

"In scientific philosophy, Karl Popper pioneered the use of the term "conjecture" to indicate a proposition which is presumed to be real, true, or genuine, mostly based on inconclusive grounds, in contrast with a hypothesis (hence theory, axiom, principle), which is a testable statement based on accepted grounds."

One slight problem here: "conjecture" to indicate a proposition which is presumed to be real, true, or genuine, mostly based on inconclusive grounds" one small issue mike is that the only reason to presume your conjecture to be true is because you say so...

Sounds mostly based on inconclusive grounds to me.

sorry mike there isn't a single intellectual out there who would support what your doing, hiding behind semantics... you think that by saying its a conjecture you can just sidestep all criticism, which is what you do, your an idiot, conjecture doesn't keep you from being wrong...

You're right.

The purpose of a conjecture is to improve on myths and assumptions.

That's a direct paraphrase of Popper.

The purpose behind Popper's method of falsification is to be wrong. As wrong as possible. Quantitatively.

Obviously you never actually read popper, so in fact we can just add liar to your ever expanding resume..

I've read Logic of Scientific Discovery, All Life is Problem Solving, Objective Knowledge: an evolutionary approach, and The Open Societies and Its Enemies.

Years ago I had more time.

Re: Mike Helland Reading List

You are working with a version of the scientific method that has been outdated since the 1950s.

Your working with a scientific method that you made up... who dumber under the context...

Popper wrote in the introduction to Logic of Scientific Discovery that the scientific method doesn't exist beyond the scheme conjecture and refutation.

I'm using the most modern version of the scientific method.

Yours is straight out 1750.

Not to mention you don't have a clue as to the scientific method if one looks at your paper... so the non-scientist cash register programmer (Mike Helland) is telling the mathematician and scientist (me) that I don't know what I am doing...

I never said you don't know what you're doing.

I said you don't understand what I'm doing.

Big difference.

<snip> wiser then you...

Lol.

.