

# Re: Science Scientists and Scientism

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-06/msg00186.html>

---

- *From:* "Androcles" <[Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:Headmaster@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 2 Jun 2008 11:22:44 +0100
- 

<kronecker@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message  
[news:bad1af07-4f5a-4851-98aa-26b02b4de627@xx](mailto:news:bad1af07-4f5a-4851-98aa-26b02b4de627@xx)

| On Jun 2, 10:54 am, rick\_so...@xxxxxxxx wrote:

| > If you compare religion to modern science, you will find some  
| > differences in the way that people approach the same problem. The  
| > search for truth.  
| > Regardless of dogma most people in both camps will say they are truth  
| > seekers.

| >  
| > Now if I may give a couple examples of religion at work, for instance  
| > the Catholic's have confessional, and the Scientologists have the E  
| > meter.  
| > With Catholicism, confession is supposed to relieve your conscience,  
| > and the E meter does similar.

| >  
| > Now I am not going to go any further into the religious side, other  
| > than to say, that these people believe what they do is based on truth.

| >  
| > If you tell the truth, your conscience will be relieved.

| >  
| > You may have watched the TV series COPS where they will frisk a  
| > scruffy looking suspect looking for drugs and the cop will say to the  
| > bad guy, the truth will set you free. And then once he confesses, they  
| > slap the cuffs on him.  
| > So obviously it is not setting that guy free. So then whats the story  
| > here?

| >  
| > Well the actual quote, you rarely hear. "You will come to know the  
| > truth, and the truth, shall set you free"

| >  
| > So it is the search for truth, which sets you free, not you telling  
| > the truth necessarily.

| >  
| > And so how do we find the truth in a world which is full of cops and  
| > robbers?

| >  
| > In science we use philosophy. Philosophy is used to reason out truths,  
| > which once established as truth, are forever true.

## Re: Science Scientists and Scientism

|>  
|> Now by this I mean as a simple example:  
|> true is not false.  
|>  
|> There is a simple philosophical statement that is true today and will  
|> forever be true.  
|> Philosophy, will tell us, that will always be the case.  
|>  
|> Now then what if someone said, yes but in Quantum physics, true can  
|> sometimes be false.  
|>  
|> Philosophy tells us, that is not a true statement.  
|>  
|> In all the confusion and all the complication, it is easy, for people  
|> to believe things, which sound true, look true, feel true, but yet are  
|> false.  
|>  
|> Another thing that science does it uses math to determine a truth.  
|>  
|>  $2 + 2 = 4$  and it will always equal 4.  
|>  
|> A simple eternal truth.  
|>  
|> But now what if someone was using calculus, and said yes but with the  
|> new axioms, (which no one but this panel of experts understands)  $2$   
|> plus  $2$  does not always equal  $4$ .  
|>  
|> Philosophy tells us, that is not a true statement.  
|>  
|> You see people will always try to create new ways to confuse the  
|> issues, complicate things to the point where the truth cannot be found  
|> in this world of cops and robbers.  
|>  
|> Hence the need for science to be tempered with philosophy, so that the  
|> houses we build are built on truth, not on supposition, or the opinion  
|> of a panel of experts, or expert liars.  
|>  
|> People are always arguing over the physical laws, and being very  
|> obstinate about such things as the conservation of energy principal.  
|> Or perpetual motion, or all these various things even though our  
|> physics is not complete and we really don't know all there is to know  
|> about things and we could be wrong about a lot of things.  
|> You will always hear people say well it is just a theory and you  
|> cannot prove it completely one way or another.  
|>  
|> We need a particle accelerator the size of the solar system and etc.  
|>  
|> But with philosophy the types of truths we deal with, they are simple  
|> truths, more than simple facts. Often they have no material substance,  
|> and are based on pure reason.  
|>

## Re: Science Scientists and Scientism

|> For instance true is not false.  
|>  
|> Now by our defining those terms, we are creating an eternal truth.  
|>  
|> By pure definition many truths are established.  
|>  
|> The meter is equal to a hundred centimeters because we said it was so.  
|>  
|> So we ourselves, have great power in creating truths.  
|> Providing the way the universe works in its own daily business is not  
|> affected by these truths.  
|>  
|> We cannot dictate to the universe what truth is when it comes to its  
|> own business.  
|>  
|> Quantum fluctuations of the statistical norm, are almost always going  
|> to Heisenberg your parade if you try to establish a physical truth.  
|>  
|> But the truths that are based on pure reason, once established as  
|> truth, are forever true.  
|>  
|> Is it so important to actually have truth, use truth, be truthful? Can  
|> we not just get by like the universe being true sometimes and  
|> sometimes not?  
|>  
|> If you want reliability, and consistency, and predictability, then you  
|> need to use truth, to establish that.  
|>  
|> And that is the point.  
|>  
|> To be able to be confident, that your projections, are reliable,  
|> accurate, consistent, and hence useful to others.  
|>  
|> And once established as scientific fact, then you can build on that  
|> premise.  
|>  
|> So you sometimes will find that people will get through the gauntlet  
|> in science with things that may or may not be true, and people will  
|> then, try to make claim that they have been proven as true, and then  
|> use that as a basis for their own next building block. And they will  
|> do this in specific fields where there may be few people who  
|> understand what they are talking about and it gets referred to  
|> experts, and they may be dubious experts, and they may say to  
|> themselves oh my god, how did all this get through the peer review  
|> process???  
|> And then they will look at where they are at, in that chain of lies,  
|> and misconceptions, missteps and half truths, and say well, what am I  
|> supposed to do now, other than what everyone else has done in the past  
|> with regards to this mess, and so I should just go along with the  
|> others and nod my head.  
|>

## Re: Science Scientists and Scientism

| > And well that is part of the game. But it needn't be part of your  
| > game.  
| > The game of cops and robbers is everywhere out in the real world too,  
| > but not everyone is playing.  
| >  
| > So you can choose to deal with only those things which are true and  
| > plainly so.  
| >  
| > This desire to put ones name on a formula or process or to have a  
| > legacy of some sort, does tend to make people want to add to things  
| > which maybe have no real basis in fact to begin with.  
| > That is part of scientism. It looks like science, it smells like  
| > science it tastes like science, but it is not science.  
| >  
| > If it cannot be explained in simple terms for all to understand,  
| > chances are it is not true.  
| >  
| > You don't need to hide the truth in confusion and complication, but  
| > you do need to hide half truths that way.  
|  
| This is bollocks of the finest. Whilst certain Scientists do sometimes  
| behave like priests and some priests do molest children, this does not  
| imply that ALL of them are at it on each side! Science is not a blind  
| faith but can be overthrown (a theory at least) by new evidence. This  
| was the case with Newtonian Physics. It was not wrong but only applied  
| under certain conditions. A more general theory was required. We still  
| seek the ultimate truth in such matters but this does not make it a  
| belief system like religion. There is no worshipping or prayers, holy  
| books etc. The trouble with religion is that it cannot be challenged.  
| It is blind faith. If I believe in the power of the almighty green  
| banana – that it gives me comfort then who are you to deny me this!  
| The majority of experiments in Science are repeatable. When you turn  
| the light switch on it always happens. Not just when the green banana  
| says so. A world without Science would be a very dark one indeed.  
|

This is bollocks of the foulest.

Science is the observation, investigation and explanation of natural phenomena, not the setting up of theories to be knocked down again by experiment (which are part of the investigation, not the explanation). No "general theory" is required. Whether you believe in general theories or green bananas you are still practicing blind faith, confusing technology with science. Laws of Nature have no exceptions but when you turn the light switch on it does NOT always happen. A world without technology would still be lit by the Sun.

—

Why did Einstein say  
the speed of light from A to B is  $c-v$ ,  
the speed of light from B to A is  $c+v$ ,  
the "time" each way is the same?

Re: Science Scientists and Scientism

$$1/2[\tau(A)+\tau(A')]= \tau(B)$$

where

$$A = (0,0,0,t)$$

$$A' = (0,0,0,t+x'/(c-v) +x'/(c+v))$$

$$B = (x',0,0,t+x'/(c-v))$$

$$x' = x-vt$$

Ref: <http://www.fourmilab.ch/etexts/einstein/specrel/www/figures/img22.gif>

"Easy: he did NOT say that." – cretin harald.vanlintelButNotThis@xxxxxxx

Androcles

.